

JPJRS 14/2 ISSN 0972-3331, July 2011 103-116

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4284216

Stable URL: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4284216>

‘With Boundary beyond Boundary:’ Towards a New-ward Journeying

Johnson J. Puthenpurackal, OFM Cap

Vijnananilayam, Janampet, Vijayarai-534475, Eluru, A.P.

Abstract: We, humans, have made great strides in investigative thought and scientific achievement. There has been growth and development in all realms and dimensions of human existence. Humans have been creatively growing in thought and action, since they have been creative and dynamic in their being. This aspect of humans’ creative dynamism may be referred to as their ‘new-ward journeying,’ a theme very close to Kunnumpuram’s theology. This paper takes a philosophical look at the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ of this journeying—a journeying ‘with boundary beyond boundary.’ The author begins with a philosophical clarification of the dynamic character of human existence, and then proceeds to show that human life and thought is a ‘journeying.’ Finally he dwells on the meaning of journeying ‘with boundary beyond boundary’.

The author concludes this philosophically reflective study with a twofold plea—a plea to keep on creatively journeying ahead in our thinking and acting, and a plea to break open the boundaries that are human constructs.

Keywords: Boundary; Beyond boundary; Creativity; *Grenzsituation*; Human existence; Journey.

Humans have made great strides in investigative thought and scientific achievement. There has been growth and development in all realms and dimensions of human existence. Humans have been creatively growing in thought and action, since they have been

creative and dynamic in their being. This aspect of humans' creative dynamism may be referred to as their 'new-ward journeying.' This paper takes a philosophical look at the 'what' and the 'how' of this journeying—a journeying 'with boundary beyond boundary.' We shall begin with a philosophical clarification of the dynamic character of human existence (1), and then proceed to show that human life and thought is a 'journeying' (2), and finally dwell on the meaning of journeying 'with boundary beyond boundary' (3).¹

1. The Dynamic Character of Human Existence

In contemporary thought the human is considered a movement, a dynamic process, an ever-moving and never-ending journeying—all these meanings are summed up in one term 'existence,' as understood in existentialism, which needs to be clarified.

Existence, according to the existentialists, is to be taken in the active and dynamic sense of the act of being human, as different from its passive meaning of the fact of being human.² Existence in the active and dynamic sense can be applied only to humans; only they are able to exist. By being born of humans I do not necessarily exist as human; only insofar as I exist as human, I am human and I become human. I exist as human by choosing to be human—by dynamically making choices every moment to grow in my being human. This dynamic meaning of existence can be better expressed and clarified with the help of its etymological meaning of 'standing-out' (ex + stare). I exist as standing out. But where does the human stand out from and stand out to? A cursory look into the whence and the whither of existence will enable us to better understand the human as dynamic and creative.

Taking cue from the trend of thinking unfolded in contemporary philosophy, and with the help of a few creative coinage of expressions, we shall elucidate the various dynamic aspects implied in the meaning of existence. By virtue of existence human being 'stands out' from the 'uniform' of a being to its 'uniqueness.' Humans cannot just be levelled down to the level of other beings. The human is not just one of the various beings, rather it is uniquely different from every other being; humans have something *extra* that other beings do not have;³ and this 'extra' in humans consists in their

ability to be dynamic and creative. But even by being uniquely different from all other beings, humans tend to remain anonymous and 'faceless' in the crowd. From such '*anonymity*' existing humans stand out to their '*individuality*.'⁴ To be anonymous in and to flow with the crowd one does not need to make any choice. By being submerged in anonymity one loses one's identity; one becomes no one, from which situation the humans as existent stand out. Although humans are thrown into some situation, they are not condemned to it; as existing beings they can stand out, to a certain extent, from the '*staticity*' of their givenness to the '*dynamism*' of growth. It is this ability that explains the growth and development that humans have been achieving in comparison to the non-human creatures that remain perennially stagnant.⁵ As human beings are constantly in a process, we cannot encapsulate or 'enframe' them in dead concepts and statements. In other words, humans stand out from the '*fixity*' of their nature to the process of '*becoming*;' they are constantly *journeying*. Humans as existing stand out from the spatio-temporal limit as well;⁶ standing out from the 'stagnancy' of the now (time) and from the 'boundary' of the here (space), humans widen their spatio-temporal horizon. By virtue of their existence, humans have the ability to extend themselves from the 'now' to the 'every-when' and from the 'here' to the 'every-where.'

The meaning of the 'whither' of existence—where one is journeying to in one's life—elucidated along with that of the 'whence' of it, can be summed up in one phrase: by one's existence human being stands out into oneself, into one's ability to be oneself; in other words, one is journeying to oneself. My being is characterized by a 'can be' aspect, because of which I am free and able to choose from the indefinite possibilities to create myself. Almost all the existential thinkers hold to the priority of self-creativity in the humans. For Nietzsche (1844-1900), human existence is characterized by 'overcoming oneself,' a 'tight-rope walker' who is always on the move.⁷ Human existence as the never-ending movement consists in one's fundamental 'can be' or ability to be oneself, to create oneself in freedom—in the language of Kierkegaard (1813-55), an existential choice⁸ to be oneself, and in the language of Heidegger (1889-1976), ontological transcendence or self-transcendence.

Existence, the creative ability of the humans, is given an ontological depth by Heidegger in his existential analysis. He shows that the human has an ontic priority over other entities because of 'existence' (*Existenz*) and 'mineness' (*Jemeinigkeit*). Existence refers to Dasein's [human's] Being as 'having-to-be' (*Zu-sein*) which combines its twofold nuance: can-be (*pouvoir-être*) and 'ought-to-be' (*devoir-être*).⁹ Existence is not a category, but 'the relation of Dasein to its potentiality-for-Being' (*Seinkönnen*). As existence, Dasein has the character of 'having-to-be;' but having to be, what? Here comes the role of the other characteristic, 'mineness.' As having-to-be, Dasein has the 'can-be' of choosing from the possible ways for it to be, and the 'ought-to-be' of choosing its 'ownmost' (*das eigenste*) possibility. When Dasein chooses itself in its ownmost possibility, it is said to be authentic (*eigentlich*), or else in-authentic (*un-eigentlich*). Combining both the existential characteristics of 'existence' and 'mineness' we can say that Dasein is 'mine-to-be'—having to choose to be myself. As the human is ordinarily prone not to be itself in its dynamic choosing, there is engrained in the very Being of the human a constant call—a call from itself to itself to be itself.¹⁰ This ontological call is ontically responded to by the human by means of its 'resoluteness' (*Entschlossenheit*),¹¹ which is a personally and individually made choice to be oneself.

The meaning of existence, as elucidated above in a rather abstruse and technical language, sings the same chorus: human being is primarily and essentially dynamic and creative. Humans become human, not by maintaining themselves in existence, but by growing in their existence; and this 'dynamic becoming' is the philosophical meaning of existence. Humans are able to be; they are gifted with transcendence or 'can be' aspect. The animals merely are; we the humans exist insofar as we can keep on growing in what we are. The ability to create oneself is not merely a gift to be preserved, but a moral responsibility to be constantly responded to. What we are, we can be; if we can be what we are, then we ought to be so—the trilogy of is-can-ought! A little explanation seems to be in place. My being human is not something that is statically given to me; it is given to me with a 'can-be'—with my ability to grow in my being human. If I am given that ability, I ought to make use of this ability. Thus 'can-be' goes with 'ought-to-be.' This fundamental moral

responsibility or ought-character is ingrained in the 'can-be' character of every human being. Thus human existence as a new-ward journeying towards itself implies and involves the fundamental responsibility of the humans to be human.

2. Human Life and Thought Is a 'Journeying'

As delineated above, humans in their being are creative and dynamic; *a fortiori* their life and thought can rightly be characterized as a *way*, as a *journeying*, as a *process*. 'Way' implies 'movement'—the 'whence' and the 'whither' of the movement are not of importance; the *moving* is of real importance. In order to highlight the relation between movement and way, Heidegger has beautifully made use of the archaic form of the German term for 'movement' (*Bewegung*)—its archaic form is *Be-wäg-ung* (way-making movement). The 'way' goes on, but there is the constant temptation to 'fix' a goal or a 'whither' for it. Thus we have different schools of thought, each school giving their own 'fixed label' to the way. The 'way' remains the same, but different people appropriate it differently, as a result of which the 'way' gets stagnated.

In the East the notion of the 'way'—its corresponding terms: *Mârga* in India, and *Tâo* in China—has been in use from ancient times to refer to the 'philosophy of life.' Although the term, *Mârga*, is used mainly in the religious context and *Tâo* in the social context, they are not confined only to these limited contexts; these have become general notions referring to humans' philosophy of life. Irrespective of religions and philosophies, the thought-pattern of the East, specifically that of India and China, has been in the mode of 'way.' Everyone is in the stream of way—stream of life and thought; everyone is 'moving' or 'journeying.' As the 'way' cuts across the barriers of religious and philosophical boundaries, Eastern thought has been generally known for its openness and tolerance.

In the West only in the contemporary period philosophy began to be considered as a *way*, as a *movement*—as a process of thinking, rather than as a product of thought. It is evident from the increased use of the term 'philosophizing' rather than 'philosophy.'¹³ Although even in philosophical circles these terms are mistakenly used as synonymous, they are very much different from each other in their

meaning and *content*. The term 'philosophy' is nominal in its structure, static and dead in its meaning, and refers to the finished product of thought, while the term 'philosophizing' is verbal in its structure, dynamic and alive in its meaning, and refers to the process of thinking. Philosophy refers to a set of stagnated meaning, characterized by 'sameness' every-where and every-when—universal and perennial. Such an understanding is slowly disappearing. This change from a static to a dynamic meaning cannot be easily maintained in the term 'philosophy,' as it is laden with an established traditional meaning. Contemporary thought-pattern has destroyed such a myth, and has opted for a more dynamic and humble attitude: *dynamic*, because every reality is philosophically seen as becoming; *humble*, because there is no dogmatism of absolute certainty about what is philosophically seen. The term 'philosophizing' reflects such a philosophical *dynamism* and *humility* of being constantly in search, taking serious consideration of the elements of time and space. From what is explained above, we are not proposing that the term 'philosophy' be replaced with 'philosophizing'; rather we want to bring to attention that there is a difference in the meaning of these terms, and that in the contemporary understanding 'philosophy' should have a meaning with a philosophical dynamism and humility, which is better reflected in the term *philosophizing*.

Philosophy today in the West, especially with the advent of phenomenology, existentialism, and postmodernism, is increasingly considered as a *way*, a movement. To refer to a few of the thinkers, Marcel (1889-1973) considers philosopher as a '*viator*' (one who is journeying) and philosophy as '*via*' (way); Nietzsche (1844-1900) refers to the movement-aspect by his use of poetic expressions, such as 'bridge,' 'tight-rope-walker,' 'becoming,' 'overcoming,' etc. Heidegger, together with Nietzsche, has prepared the ground for the destruction of the myth of 'absolutism' in philosophy, and Derrida (1930-2004) and other postmodernists have executed it. Thus we find that, of late, there is a growing tendency towards considering philosophy as a 'movement,' as a 'way.'

Just as thought is a *way* (*via*) and thinker is a *wayfarer* (*viator*), so also the life of thinking can rightly be considered as a 'wayfaring' or 'journeying.' The 'way' goes on; the journeying too goes on. Such

a journeying is characterized as a ‘*new-ward* journeying,’ which is not same as a journey in search of mere novelties. We take ‘*new-ward* journeying’ as a constant and authentic growth of one’s being, whereas ‘journeying for novelties’ is an uprooted jumping from novelty to novelty.¹⁴ In this case one takes hold of anything that one finds as novel, which need not necessarily fall along with one’s being. Such a journey of life is a ‘*wayward* journeying,’ rather than ‘*new-ward* journeying.’

It is by constantly making existential choices to be one’s authentic self, one’s being, that human being keeps on making new-ward journeying. This process of choice is an ‘ontological transcendence’—it is *ontological* because it is a choice for one’s *Being*, in response to the call from one’s *Being*, as a result of one’s proneness of falling from one’s *Being*.¹⁵ The journey is always towards one’s very being, creating oneself, and thus becoming oneself. It is a new-ward journeying since it is a ‘growing in one’s being,’ as different from ‘straying from one’s being,’ which is but a wayward journeying.

3. Journeying ‘with Boundary and beyond Boundary’

We have delineated that humans are, and are called to be, on the way in a new-ward journeying. But does this journeying or ontological transcendence take the human away from oneself, away from the finite being that one is? It is a journeying that refers, at the same time, both to one’s going *beyond* and to one’s standing *with* one’s being. We characterize this specific process of movement with the expression: ‘*with boundary beyond boundary*.’ What is intended by this expression can be clarified only by elucidating the notion of ‘boundary.’¹⁶

The notion of ‘boundary’ is relatively of recent origin and in the wake of the philosophy of finitude in the contemporary period, it is gaining greater importance.¹⁷ Instead of delving into the philosophy of finitude, we shall limit ourselves to taking a reflective look at the philosophical meaning of ‘boundary.’ The ordinary meaning of *boundary* as ‘limit-line’ was carried further into a philosophical meaning by Karl Jaspers in his notion of ‘*Grenzsituation*’ (limit-situation), which was taken over by Heidegger in his analysis of

Dasein with a deeper meaning of the radical finitude of humans.¹⁸ The basis of any philosophy of finitude is the radical finitude of humans; and Heidegger's philosophy is nothing but a loud meditation on human finitude. Hence by making a reflective journey along with him and beyond him, we will have some grip on the philosophical meaning of boundary.

Through an existential analysis of death Heidegger takes his thought to an ontological characterization of human finitude.¹⁹ Human being, as primarily existential, has always some possibility or ahead-of-itself. The ultimate possibility or *not-yet* of the human is its death. Death as the ultimate 'not-yet' is already always present as soon as and as long as the human being is. In the ordinary conception, death is considered as an event of a moment in the distant future. But death cannot be limited to just a moment, it is rather a constant and certain possibility into which I am irrevocably thrown! Death is both the ultimate *not-yet* and the ultimate *already*. The ultimate possibility and facticity of the human encircles and demarcates its total *that-it-is* or wholeness, which is but its 'limit-situation' or 'boundary-situation' (*Grenzsituation*).²⁰ As the human is constantly with its ultimate possibility, the encircling 'line' that demarcates its limit-situation remains constantly closest to it. Human finitude is nothing but this permeating presence of the limit in its Being. I am, so to say, saturated with *death* as the boundary or limit. Death is the permeating presence of the limit in every fibre of the human being. It is the *way* the humans exist—the finite *way* of human existence. Human being is thus characterized by radical finitude—human being is *with boundary*.

Traditionally human finitude has been considered as a 'lack,' as a 'less' in relation to the *Infinite*. Such an approach may show the fact of human finitude, but it falls short of showing the essence of human finitude. Humans are finite not because they are less than the Infinite; humans are finite because they *are finite in their very Being*, that is to say, there is present a '*finis*' (limit, boundary) in the Being of the humans. According to Heidegger, boundary is not that at which something comes to a stop, rather it is that from which something begins or wells out. Boundary is not the end, it

is the beginning. Hence humans are finite, not because of the approaching end (*Ende*), but because of the essentially finite (*endlich*) way they are. Boundary is not around us; it is permeatingly present in us, and hence we are ontologically finite. This ontological finitude is manifest in all the ontic situations as well.²¹ Thus the human being is saturated with boundary or limit, and hence s/he is finite.

After having dwelt, in the first two parts this study, on the aspect of the human's 'new-ward journeying,' we have introduced here the notion of 'boundary' or finitude. Does the new-ward journeying come to a stop with the boundary? The acceleration of the forward movement of human existence is decelerated with human finitude. The genius of Heidegger has perfectly blended in his philosophy these apparently opposed movements as the twofold tension of the same movement. This twofold tension, in the terminology of this study, is referred to as 'with boundary beyond boundary.' This is solidly based on Heidegger's words: human existence is "thrown into the indefiniteness of its 'limit-situation'..."²² On the one hand, the human is thrown into limit-situation, and thus it is with boundary; on the other hand, the existential movement to the limit-situation is a movement to indefiniteness, as 'the limit is indefinite,' and hence 'beyond boundary.' The boundary of my boundary remains always indefinite. The beyond boundary is always with boundary. This twofold tension between 'with boundary' and 'beyond boundary'—givenness and choosing, facticity and existentiality, rootedness and openness—is referred to also in another of his expressions 'being stretched along and stretching itself along' (*erstrecktes Sicherstrecken*).²³ I am able to keep on moving in my existence and transcending myself (I am stretching myself), and thus I am able to be beyond every (definite) boundary. But in stretching myself along, I am stretched along as well. I do not and cannot get away from my boundary.

To put it in simpler language, human being as existence is dynamic and self-creative. It keeps on growing and journeying ahead in its existence. But while journeying ahead into the indefiniteness of its being, the human continues to be radically

finite. In spite of the multifarious growth and development of humans, they can never get rid of their finitude. Hence the new-ward journeying of the humans is a finite journeying—a journeying *with boundary beyond boundary*.

4. Concluding Plea

We conclude this philosophically reflective study with a twofold plea—a plea to keep on creatively journeying ahead in our thinking and acting, and a plea to break open the boundaries that are constructed by humans.

The first plea for creativity in human existence, which is implicitly proposed in this paper, is fast becoming a rarity in today's culture. As against the popular belief that humans are on a fast track towards creative growth and development, we find that contemporary culture is in fact stagnating human thinking and acting. We live in a culture of ready-mades. Our markets are flooded with ready-mades of every kind: apparently a sign of human growth and development! It is true, the struggle of life is very much taken away, and life can be lived with greater ease and comfort; we have today ready-made dresses, ready-made sermons, ready-made decorations, ready-made gardens, ready-made everything... But, to the thinking people, the life of ready-mades stagnates human growth. Why do I say so? By having recourse to the ready-mades, our ability to do anything and to decide anything is being taken away. Gradually and systematically we are made *incapable* persons—unable to calculate, calculators do it; unable to prepare any curry, ready-made is available; unable to prepare a sermon, they are available as ready-made; unable to reflect philosophically or theologically, ready-made thoughts are available on the website; ...thus, we are made thoughtless and useless. The success of the market consists in making us as incapable as possible. Our inability is their ability! Besides making us incapable to do many things, the market-culture takes away from us the ability to think and to decide for ourselves. We can no more decide what to wear, what to eat, what to drink, what to preach...the creativity and variety due to individual reflections, thoughts and decisions is taken away from us. We do not decide anymore; it is decided for us. Gradually our

ability to think and decide is drained out from us; and we are becoming useless dolls!

It is against this background that we say: 'the new-ward journeying of creative thinking is becoming a rare phenomenon!' The constant temptation with the vast majority of the humans is to fall back on the readily available, and thus they do not take the risk of creative thinking and acting; and hence this plea is relevant and makes sense. In the creative journeying ahead (beyond boundary), one has to keep oneself constantly reminded of remaining fully rooted in one's finite givenness (with boundary). While creatively taking a step ahead, one does not uproot oneself from the given. It is I myself—the I who have been with all my givenness and tradition, the I who have been empowered and enabled by my givenness—who keep on taking creative steps in my life of thought and action. My being 'with boundary' and 'beyond boundary' cannot be separated.²⁴

The second plea is with regard to the 'boundary' of human existence. The human is a finite being because of the boundary *within*, which is not in fact a lack or limitation. But there is another type of boundary—the boundary *without* that makes them really limited and mutilated! Humans have been creating numerous boundaries around them for various reasons of human construct.²⁵ As a result, a strong feeling of 'we' as different from 'they' is created, and those outside the boundary are looked at with suspicion. It is because of the powerlessness or limitation of those within the boundary that they keep on creating more boundaries, and others are looked at as a threat. The more boundaries, the greater the limitation! On the other hand, the boundary-less persons are more secure and less limited. Only when humans are able to transcend the boundary of *here* and *now* in their very being—manifested in thinking, speaking and dealing—do they become *cosmic persons* in a cosmic home. Instead of creating more limiting boundaries, the cosmic persons keep on breaking open the various concentric circles of boundaries and open themselves out to the wider horizon of the cosmos. Humans cannot do away with their ontological boundary of finitude; but should they become really 'smaller' and 'mutilated' by creating more boundaries around them? Hence our plea: create

not boundaries around us, and break open those that are already there; humans with their inner boundary are thus called to be cosmic persons without any outer boundary!

As the immediate reference of this study is the new-ward journeying of theological thinking, let it be reiterated that there are no ready-made theologies to be preserved and to be transmitted. Just as the way comes to be as one journeys and the song comes to be as one sings, so also theology comes to be as one theologizes. A responsible journeying of theologizing comes about when one theologizes in response to the reality of the 'here' and 'now' of one's life and world—a theologizing in full acceptance of one's boundary without any pretence or claim of absolutism. It should vibrate as a constant 'echo' in one's life, and should send ripples of this vibration beyond the 'here' and 'now' to every-where and every-when. Such a responsible theologizing is made possible by a life of new-ward journeying with boundary beyond boundary.

Notes

1. As this article is for a Festschrift in honour of Rev. Dr. Kurien Kunnumpuram, SJ, who has been, during the past several decades, making a creative journeying of theologizing supported by his investigative thirst and intellectual acumen, the present author considers it a privilege reflectively to delve into the question of 'humans as journeying'—the foundation of all investigative creativity [Author's own.]
2. In the traditional understanding, existence (is-ness) has been understood in opposition to essence (whatness), which is applied to everything including the humans. In this traditional sense the mere fact of being human is one's existence.
3. The existentialists have limited the use of 'existence' only to the humans. Only the humans 'exist;' all other things are. Heidegger goes to the extent of saying that even God too is; only Dasein (the human) exists.
4. The main spokesperson for this position is Kierkegaard; while clarifying the meaning of existence, he refers to the act of standing out or choosing to be an individual from being anonymous in the crowd.
5. Look at the way the birds make their nests, the bees collect honey, the dogs bark, the fishes swim: there is absolutely no growth in the way these activities are carried out. On the contrary, the humans have been making progress in every aspect of their life.

6. This does not mean that they become beyond space and time; the humans while transcending the limit do not overcome the limit.
7. Nietzsche refers to the human being also as a 'rope' that is tied between, or a bridge between, the animal (at times, the ultimate man) and the superman.
8. It is Kierkegaard, and to a lesser degree Heidegger, who have worked it out in their philosophy. Kierkegaard takes choice as a 'leap.' It is in proportion to the gravity of the question on which I make a choice that there will be the greater or lesser struggle of choice. In every leap, in an eminent way, in the leap of faith, I am in the grip of anxiety or struggle of choice: should I, should I not? This struggle is created by 'objective uncertainty' and 'subjective certainty;' insofar as that which I choose or leap to remains in darkness, I am repelled by it, and insofar as I am subjectively clear about it I am attracted by it. This experience of attraction and repulsion, sympathy and antipathy, is the existential struggle of choice—the experience of anxiety. I am as though sitting on a precipice, attracted to and repelled from taking the leap. Faith as leap links and dissolves the objective uncertainty and subjective certainty. It is the struggle of choice to be oneself. Cf. *ACPI Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed., Johnson J. PUTHENPURACKAL. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 2010, s.v. "Choice, Existential."
9. For a more elaborate consideration of this point, cf., Johnson J. PUTHENPURACKAL, *Heidegger, Through Authentic Totality to Total Authenticity: A Unitary Approach to His Thought in Its two Phases* (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1987), pp. 8-10; see also, footnote 33 on page 9.
10. Cf., HEIDEGGER, *Being and Time*, trans., John Macquarrie and Edwards Robinson, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), pp. 317-23.
11. Ibid., p. 343. The term, *Entschlossenheit*, combines in itself the twofold nuance of the ordinary meaning of 'decision,' and the etymological meaning of 'opening.'
12. Cf. Johnson PUTHENPURACKAL, "Way-Mârga-Tão," in *ACPI Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 2010), pp. 1513-15.
13. What is said here about 'philosophy' and 'philosophizing' is equally valid with regard to 'theology' and 'theologizing.'
14. The inspiration for this thought is Heidegger's characterization of historicity, according to which authentic historizing is a choosing of possibilities that are inherited from one's being, whereas inauthentic historizing takes place in terms of mere novelties. Cf. Martin HEIDEGGER, *Being and Time*, trans., John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), pp. 443-44.

15. The reference here is Heidegger's analysis of conscience as a call 'from itself to itself to be itself.'
16. The following section is largely based on a study that the present author has carried out in the article: "Boundary," in *ACPI Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 2010), pp. 191-92.
17. Although there are many philosophers who vouch for a philosophy of finitude, Heidegger stands prominent among them with his philosophy in the form of meditation on human finitude.
18. Heidegger refers to Karl JASPERS in his *Sein und Zeit* (15th ed., Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1979, footnote on pp. 301-02). Jaspers speaks of three types of 'limit-situation' that exhibit the pathos of human existence: its striving, the opposing contradictions and the resultant antinomies. Heidegger takes inspiration from Jaspers and gives the term a rather different meaning. Cf. David F. KRELL, "Toward Sein und Zeit: Heidegger's Early Review of Jasper's 'Psychologie der Weltanschauungen,'" *Journal of British Society for Phenomenology* 6 (1975): 150.
19. Heidegger carries out his analysis of death in the first chapter of the second division of his *Being and Time* (pp. 279-311).
20. Cf. Martin HEIDEGGER, *Being and Time*, p. 356.
21. My ontological finitude consists in the presence of 'limit' in my ability to be myself—in my ontological 'can.' Such an ontological 'can'—the 'can' that is saturated with 'cannot'—qualifies every 'can' of mine. In other words, I am finite—I am with boundary—both ontologically and ontically.
22. "...in die Unbestimmtheit seiner 'Grenzsituation' geworfen ist..." Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* (15th ed., Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1979), p. 308; *Being and Time*, p. 356.
23. HEIDEGGER, *Being and Time*, p. 427.
24. A rather detailed study on this question is carried out by the present author in a paper titled "Rooted in Tradition – Open to Innovation: Philosophical Reflections," presented at the ACPI Annual Seminar Held at Faridabad on 23-27 October 2010.
25. On this question of 'creation of boundaries' as one of the reasons for human violence, cf., Johnson PUTHENPURACKAL, "Humans as Violent: A Philosophical Look," in *Violence and Its Victims: A Challenge to Philosophizing in the Indian Context*, ed., Ivo COELHO (Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 2010), pp. 30-32.