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This article holds the maintaining of peace, subsequent to civil war, at its heart, as its raison d'être, its movement, its call for the terms in question—ground, attunement and mourning—and for language as what will allow for their development and constitute a lasting bringing-together for a post-war people. I describe this language as a return to what is “ownmost”, what is foundational, even while its essence is hidden and is to be brought into thinking. The return in question is a coming back from what is foreign. The foreign one returns from here is that of someone entfremd or, better still, estranged, finding him/herself outside what is his/her most proper being as being-historical. Such a return is to lead to true reconciliation—one first with oneself and then with others as belonging to and called for by the same instance: language as the possibility of mourning and of mourning-with, constituting a new departure for resilient peaceful existence. The task is then twofold: in its theoretical aspect, it develops the being of language as/from the very possibility and actuality of the ground-attunement of mourning; in its practical aspect it demands that each one involved heed such a call in order to make its operation and the being-together it brings about effective.

Calling for the ownmost, when speaking about language, means asking for a thought that works from the very essence of things. We must then go to the very ground, to what it can bring together, to what makes it ground and then foundation, while at the same time determining attunement in its primary being, i.e. as ground-attunement, Grundstimmung. This term is our guide here, and I evince it in the way it is most prominently developed in Heidegger's thought, and although
it has attracted little attention from critics. The reader will realise that out of ground-attunement thus considered, we are able to move on to language as a locus of peace and can encounter the being-historical essence it entails. We may then see the possibilities language, thus understood, opens to bring and hold together a people, taking up the challenge of their suffering and keeping it within a mourning-together as a new departure through a new or renewed ontological relation to the essence of that language.

The choice of going to one of Heidegger's Grundstimmungen is motivated by the necessity this article takes on of going to what is most fundamental, so much so that it is pre-foundational, as it provides the ground itself for a foundation. I may not here go into a very long analysis I am carrying out elsewhere of the two parts of the word, i.e. Grund and Stimmung. I must, however, briefly undertake to develop their meaning and necessity for this article's endeavour, so that their use in the following pages may be clear.

Ground is to be seen as ground of ground, that is as the original possibility of grounding. As such, it is then, and only then, a grounding that founds on and as earth and φύσις, i.e. all that comes forth, appears, fortuitously—which is the essence of φύσις—and all that harbours, keeps hidden and preserves—which is the essence of Erde—thus allowing Dasein’s dwelling. It is the origin out of which what emerges is held in the open and sheltered, preceding what is only possible through its essence: truth, and even the problematic enframing (Gestell) and the deployment of Technik. It is at the origin of temporality and temporalises constantly in its founding operation.

Stimmung, attunement, precedes feelings and emotions—be they considered as psychological states or in any way empirically—and makes them possible, and it must be thought outside the usual

---


schemata of science and psychology. Attunements are unknowable, but they may be approached phenomeno-ontologically. While unreachable otherwise, they do ineluctably accompany all understanding as well as characterise its direction and thus all intentional work. Attunement is there and not there, and may reach into the deployment and origin of world and the worlding of, with and for Dasein, that is to say us, those beings who have in their own being a questioning of that very being, those who are the locus where being questions itself historically and through the call of language.

_Grundstimmung_, the main term we are after here—a ground-mood or ground-attunement—is an attunement that is at the very founding of being and remains there all along, even while it is often left unthought-of. Answering the call that a ground-attunement makes means entering language in the specific way it asks for, so as to adjoin, gather what is otherwise lost in its obnubilation. Its effect is to bring together, regardless of the emotions that are founded on it and can only be through it—including love, enmity, mere sadness and so on. Going toward a ground-attunement is thus a heading to the original-foundational possibilities of being in all its historico-temporal dimensions, as being-along, being-next-to, being-with, being-for and so on. As such, and as being of a people thus reached and unfolding, it is what makes a peaceful residing possible as reconciliation.

The _Grundstimmungen_ are many. Some are more prominent than others, and certain eras are marked by certain _Grundstimmungen_ that become the basis of their social, intellectual, and political framework and definition. I could have chosen a number of ground-attunements. There is the ground-attunement of anxiety, that of boredom, or those connected with the _Geviert_—of the gods, mortals, the heaven and the earth. However, considering the focus here on post-war situations, as, for instance, the one Lebanon is currently in, it is, as the reader will gradually realise, “mourning” that stands out and can work as our guide in this short study, especially as a main _telos_ of this work is to evince the essential practical consequences of mourning in effecting a

(3) See my article, “Le divin (Göttliche) au sein du Quadriparti (Geviert)”, _Rvue philosophique_, 3 (2009).
future leap, so as to reach a creative reconciliation and to build on new solid grounds.

On a first level, sorrow is a necessity for a post-war country, all the more so as it is usually, before and in the war period, not experienced from its very ground. Two problems hinder its effective realisation: its falling into forgetfulness and its possible confusion with melancholy. Indeed, a country that was involved in civil strife is one that had failed to truly enter this very ground-attunement or had fallen outside it unawares. The people may have some offshoots of its operations in the feeling of sorrow expressed at the death of family and relatives at war or just in general. They may visit each other at such occasions, up to the traditional fortieth day in some countries like Lebanon, expressing sadness in tears and words of condolence. However, emotion is only a by-product of attunement, which is itself dependent on ground-attunement. Emotion (Rührung) may even serve to dissipate any thinking concerned with what lies at the foundation of expressions and profusions of feelings of sadness at the loss of things and people one may or may not have cared about – convention has its own way of taking over and managing emotions. Sorrow as such and before the schemes of reason and the explanations of psychology through analysis or neuroscience is, in such atmosphere and acts, neither touched upon nor experienced primordially; it remains then hidden, covered over, and only its by-operations are felt, and they are in such a way as to leave the world of the post-war self/elves unquestioned and the ground-attunement of mourning ineffective in transforming the relations among the people and between them and their foundations.

As for melancholy, it should be distinguished from mourning, not as something to be rejected but as an attunement operating on a different level, and which can and should, for that matter, produce its own set of positive results. A quick consideration of it will help, through contrasts, further delimit sorrow. Heidegger defines it in the 1928-30 course, Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik: Melancholy, Schwermut, is analysed as it stems from Mut, which currently means ‘courage’, but which originally meant—and it is the meaning he retains—‘joy’ or being in ‘good spirits’. As for ‘Schwer’, it has the meaning of a weight to be shouldered, borne, accepted as such. In Schwermut, the weight in
question is that of thought and being, one which the thinker has the courage and joy to bear; and melancholy is thus identified as the ground-attunement of philosophy and traced as such all the way to Aristotle’s *Problemata*. Melancholy provides the form of philosophising and determines how philosophical questioning may be carried out. Such ground-attunement is not completely divorced from that of mourning. What they both provide, and what thus makes them sometimes run into one another and intersect, is the necessity of a weight to bear, to take on oneself. However, in the case of philosophy, the weight is that of being and thought assumed and borne by each philosopher; in the case of mourning, the weight is always shared or is taken from someone to partly unburden them. The two differ also with regards to thought. There is of course thought in and through mourning, but it is one that always already implies a ‘*mit*’, a being-‘with’, and hence a communal aspect, be it limited, as in Fichte's sense, or extended. Finally, what really sets the two *Grundstimmungen* apart is the essence of mourning, wherein a specific strife distinguishes it entirely from other ground-attunements. The strife mourning holds within it is that between joy and mourning or sorrow.

Ground-attunements open, each in its specific manner, and thus determine the way the world of a certain people deploys, or worlds, *weltet*. The way mourning opens is as that strife between joy and mourning. Heidegger describes this strife, not as mere *Streit*, but as a *Widerstreit*, expressing not a sheer ‘dispute’ but a stronger sense of ‘conflict’. ‘*Wider*’ itself means ‘against’, or better still ‘contrary to’, which gives the conflict the dimension of antagonism, of constant battle between two contraries that will yet produce, as with Heraclitus, a world. Commenting Hölderlin’s “*Brod und Wein*”’s seventh stanza, in an attempt to further define mourning, Heidegger draws the following conclusion:

---

(4) Heidegger, *Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik*, *GA*, Bd. 29/30 (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1983), 270-1. All translations from German and Arabic are my own. All references to Heidegger are to the German edition of the complete works, *Gesamtausgabe*, henceforth *GA*. Bd. indicates the volume (*Band*) number.
Here, the counter-attunement (*Gegenstimmung*) of joy is not just the well-known opposite side, but the joy that is brought to attunement (*Stimmen*) in mourning. More precisely, this attunement oscillating in (counter-) conflict is the character of ground-attunement. This attunes, each time, from the ground out, all essential attunements and determines for each, in its own way, its rank.\(^5\)

There are no “opposite sides” here, neither in the common sense we have of mere things or qualities that are opposed, nor in the sense of contradictory propositions. In both cases, we would have what is irreconcilable and our judgement is made through logic or ontology. Instead, joy and mourning are together within mourning itself – mourning is itself, it essentialises or sways (*west*) as joy. Joy is only joy from its being attuned originarily, from its ground, then up and out, through mourning. The character of this *Grundstimmung* is the very counter-movement within it, then ecstatically out, of joy and sorrow. The two are not simply intertwined but occupy the same ground whence they arise – the expression in its very first worlding (*weltend*) of *Trauer* is *Trauer* and *Freude*. If opposites there are, in the common sense, they are here feelings as such toward people and things or emotions felt in reaction to events, and such emotions, be they named joy and sadness or even mourning are but the by-products of the unity of joy and mourning in the pre-predicative and pre-psychological foundational possibilities of *Trauer*. The essence of the *separateness* of apparently opposed feelings and their irreconcilable aspect is the *unity* that precedes and allows them to be. And thus to truly share joy is to be in the attuning mood of mourning and the specific turning 'toward' and 'away from', which eventually emerge from it.

One may wonder, why the term ‘mourning’ rather than ‘joy’ is given to this ground-attunement. The answer may be easily gleaned from the primacy of *λόγος*. We may look more precisely, concerning

---

this matter, at a passage from Heidegger’s “Vom Wesen und Begriff der Phusis”:

... λόγος belongs to λέγειν, and this word means and is the same word as our “lesen” - Weinlese (grape picking, grape harvest), Ährenlese (harvesting wheat, gleaning ears of wheat), gather (sammeln).

“Lesen”, gather “sammeln”, means to bring together (zusammenbringen) what is multiple and dispersed into the One, then, at the same time, bring that One to (beibringen) and place it (zustellen) – Where? In what is unveiled in the essence/sway (Anwesung)... λέγειν – bring-together-toward-the-One (zusammen) and such a gathered ensemble (gesammelt), i.e. sway – means: from its being previously veiled, making it unveiled, leaving it to show itself through swaying/essentialising. 

What we need to retain for our purposes here, is the “gathering” that defines the very act of λόγος. Such gathering is a bringing unto oneself and thus into unity, which is in fact the very act of meditation, of Besinnung, to which Heidegger dedicates a whole course in the 1938-39 semester. Such meditation is the very operation of the word, before it opens unto the world, Dasein’s world, as a Sache, the very original saying as the poetic. Thus re-collection, Andenken, in its precise sense of first collecting unto oneself precedes and constitutes the essence of what is said as such. Silence is the essence of speech as it is the very essence of language. One is reminded of the famous Egyptian creation epic of Amen-Re, with his finger against his lips, denoting silence, and Thoth, that follows such Silence, as still Amen-Re himself, self-created, and as Logos, the Creator. What is essential here is that what meditates and gathers as such precedes and constitutes the essence of what opens and the emotions that may accompany it. Mourning, effecting always a return to oneself and to things as they manifest and are gathered into one is the name given to the ground-attunement I am studying, because it precedes and determines the essence of joy, which opens Dasein to the world where it may deploy. A people that must share the joy may

(7) Heidegger, Besinnung, GA, Bd. 66 (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1997).
not then stop at its consequent feeling but must seek an attunement that brings its members together, gives them common ground; The members of such a people then find themselves in constant mourning as we now understand it.

Reaching such ground-attunement and getting attuned (gestimmt) to it is most pressing for post-civil war situations. The years of war and their sequels leave the country outside such ground-attunement and subject to emotions and feelings that have a free-floating foundation with no coming together into a real belonging that may constitute a common departure and a national project. We may witness complaints, condolences, temporary smiles and laughs at various events, but they are in no way a thinking that returns to a common essence in the ground-attunement of mourning–there is no essential mourning-together occurring trans-individually, trans-religiously and trans-communally. For this reason the land and its people are reduced to empty definitions, which can take many forms, such as repeating incessantly, in Lebanon’s case, that it is a link between East and West–a mere relation rather than something having substance, reducing religion to tradition and negative determination through mere difference, turning abiding into isolation, and relations to mercantile exchange. The list can go on to cover all sorts of manifestations in different post-civil war countries. Whatever empty, abstract—in the Hegelian sense—slogans continue to be proclaimed, the Widerstreit between joy and mourning remains forgotten and ineffective, and the people’s ground is like an out-of-tune harp—the harmony is always already possible, what is underneath has not disappeared, it is always there, but it has been forgotten. The harp resounds out-of-tune, and its sound disappears in the humdrum of an oblivious society.

Now that the problem has been clearly pointed to, the Grundstimmung of mourning delineated and its urgent need made clear, we must expound on its operation and the ‘constructive’ things that it can and will make possible. I will start with two conjoined terms: pain and suffering-with (Schmerz and Mitleiden).

Pain here is not some kind of self-inflicted physical or mental punishment, but has to do with the call Heidegger mentions as he
comments two lines of *Germanien*: “This pain of calling, this complaint rises and oscillates in the *ground-attunement of mourning*”⁸. The pain is that of a call, one that may be better understood as a re-call and return. It is the *Schmerz* of history to be re-thought and re-appropriated. History as it is in the very essence of the people is then a call to the individuals and their being as a people. This call is that of mourning itself from its very ground; the return is what mourning demands once its call is ‘heard’ and heeded, and this return is to one’s ownmost.

Along with this taking-on of pain comes later a form of suffering as an upbuilding of each one involved. To understand such *Leiden*, we must look at ourselves from our own Being (*Sein*):

Our Being (*Sein*) is not only thrownness (*Geworfenheit*), it is also a project (*Entwurf*) ... Such Being, which in its essence is the suffering of its own self, can therefore be experienced only by the one who has the ability for such suffering... However, this suffering, in which Beyng (*Seyn*) as destiny (*Schicksal*) is revealed, is not a mere ability to seize a quasi present-at-hand fate; rather, this suffering is creative. It opens up and develops the urgent need.⁹

The Being in question is of course that of individuals and of the people they belong to. What is meant by suffering of/from “ourselves” or of/from “our Being’s self”, is a shouldering of the existence of a people as a historical people. Such shouldering is not that of a history learned in schools or at university, it is not that of a science of history, whatever version of it may be upheld, but of the people’s whole Being as traversed by history and as historical (*geschichtlich*)—the *Sein* that a people is is history, constituting and constituted through that people’s world and the events that have determined and continue to impress upon it. Suffering

---


thus taken over opens destiny (Schicksal), the way the people was and is sent (geschickt) into its world, and it thus enters this destiny knowingly, not seeking to objectify it and make it a subject of scientific inquiry but being attuned to it and projecting itself into the future, creating and letting create its world. Destiny thus revealed moves then to action, it raises in people the attunement that leads to a thinking that discovers the urgency of their situation and the need (Not) which had remained hitherto in abeyance yet ever incessant in its call for change. That need becomes clear once the past is faced from within the people’s historical Being, guided by the project of building a nation. Such building, taking over, shouldering, constituting, suffering, and pain emerge all together to our understanding as elements that necessitate not just the work of the individual or Dasein, but of Dasein-along-with-others. They hold the mark of “with”—“mit”. Thus the suffering, Leiden, is a Mitleiden,10 shouldering-with, constituting-with and so on. And we reach the realisation at this point that the ground-attunement of mourning is always one of mourning-with, Mittrauern.

To mourn is then to mourn with others. We need not expound this, it is a ‘logical’ consequence of our analysis. What is of interest here is a new implication that this Mittrauern has in the same course: It is further said to be a “Ground-attunement as mourning-with with the rivers and the homely (heimatlichen) earth”11. The rivers here are those of the homeland. They are signs of a continuous founding; they are a departure and a re-appropriating return; they spring, like the Ister, from the origin and then flow back, like the Rhine going toward Asia/Greece then veering back northward, to the origin. They are most pertinent to think of the necessary post-civil war movement of a nation. There is a going away during the war and a return that has often little success at being one in the real sense of letting oneself be reclaimed by the origin. Much is left to think here. I will simply add that rivers, thus comprehended are always, in whichever way one may take them, and by their continuous flow, renewed possibility and actuality of a residence. Residence is by their staying flow, one may say; it is a sheltering, a closing off along with others that readies the opening, a mourning-with

(10) Ibid., 181.
(11) Ibid., 87: “Die Grundstimmung als Mittrauern mit den Strömen der heimatlichen Erde.”
that prepares mourning and joy; and it occurs through a gift that renders it possible: that of Erde.

Sharing mourning, making it a foundation for a new being-together whence a productive strife arises, will only occur by taking earth into account as the first appropriation of things and as the very meaning of grounding, of the ground in Grundstimmung. Mittrauern once it is ensuring the sway or essentialising of the Being-with is thus, a specific opening of earth. It is not that of Gestell, of enframing through calculating reason, which seeks to transform the earth into a stock and thus fails each time it seeks to lay hold of its essence\(^{12}\), but a letting-the-earth open, as φύσις, and a letting oneself as Being-with be called, then answering the call and building and dwelling. As such dwelling occurs. It does not turn into isolation, a keeping away from the world and a remaining with one’s close family—the Mittrauern thus wholly swaying includes others, but in a very large sense, and lets Being-with be in tune with them through a belonging that gathers and unites and is thus given through the double operation of the Heilige—saving and making sacred.

The same passage we have been studying affirms that “the ground-attunement [here] is a holy mourning (heilige Trauer)”\(^{13}\) and that such “holy mourning “with” the homeland” is “the might of the earth”\(^{14}\). We must understand what this “holy” is and see where a new thinking of the post-intra-war condition may be understood and reformed through it, before moving on to major implications for language. It is essential to also make clear what is meant here by “Macht der Erde” and what its implications are. What is termed ‘holy’ holds within its folds two significant meanings. First, what is heil, what constitutes a Heile is what is kept safe and sound, entire, healed\(^{15}\). Working towards it calls for a sheltering which keeps the Heile as its telos. What is holy is also what is sacred, consecrated: it is the holy place, which is always under heavens and on earth, a place where powers meet and give a foundation for living, i.e. a home, Heim and a homeland, Heimat. The mourning-

---

(14) Ibid.: “Die heilige Trauer ‘mit’ der Heimat als der Macht der Erde”.
with obtains its holiness by saving, *retten*, making those who join in it safe by answering its call and responding to each other from within it. The belonging thus assured and founded in a constantly renewed affirmation opens and continues to preserve the openness of a holy place for the *we* and the pre-subjective *I*\(^\text{16}\). A holy mourning introduces a relation to the *divine* that allows for those who enter it and think from within its gifting to remain whole in their very difference and able to shoulder the strife inherent to its essence. That is precisely what “*Macht der Erde*” is meant to evince here. As a place is consecrated–whatever type of temple it may render possible–it arises or gives rise to the strife between heaven and earth. It effects a meeting of the contradictory founding forces of the transcendent and immanent, where the divine informs the place as holy and Dasein as temporal transcendence of the *we* and the *I*, and permeates the world thus founded. The emphasis is placed on the earth’s might, rather than the heaven’s force, for two reasons: Heaven, *Himmel*, is what allows the earth to open, to receive its power, it is there so that the earth will begin and renew its gifting; and the might of the earth thus unfurled is the actualised possibilities of the ground of ground, where the *heilige Mittrauern* assembles those who are appropriated, enowned (*ereignet*) through it and gives them endurance and resistance.

The characteristic or the essence of holy mourning that thus opens is interesting to our subject in one specific regard. The preserving, the very operation leading and keeping *das Heile*, is distinguished through its grounding force as a gathering, an assembling, and hence as a meditation of which the French *recueillement* is perhaps the best expression. The consecrated place where the *we* as Dasein of a people is assembled and made safe at the very heart of the strife in holy-mourning-with unfolds and functions as a place where Dasein comes back, folds unto itself, while at the same time gathering\(^\text{17}\) within its own folding and unfolding the beings it encounters in its worlding

---


world. In such a gathering, Dasein thinks and remembers; it engages in Andenken, a thinking-remembering not unlike the sense memoria gains in the work of Augustine as the very determination of thinking and presence to oneself, in a way that is more attentive to who and how we are than mere modern consciousness. The call is then heeded, the Wink (gesture) is seen as well as heard, and such a call cannot but be a voice and a word, as well as a calling, a dedication. Thus opens the essence of language.

The whole of this indicative questioning is captured in the 1946 statement of the “Brief über den “Humanismus””: “Die Sprache ist das Haus des Seins. In ihrer Behausung wohnt der Mensch”, “Language is the house of Being. Man dwells in its shelter”. Everything I have said so far is encapsulated in this sentence, which also constitutes its ultimate truth and expression. Language gestures toward its own essence as guardian. Language is not a definitional difference determining man as an Aristotelian animal rationale and speaking animal. Rather, as logos, it effects what the verb legein indicates—it assembles, gathers, then places in words—and it speaks—in it, enowned to it, man speaks, he/she is a voice and an exchange, a Gespräch. The Mittrauen is then accompanied by a speaking-with, a con-versation that brings together and founds relations that ground Dasein as we and I in a home and a homeland, and the result is a Mitwohnen, a dwelling-together, and peace. To be truly brought into the clearing that is said and answered through language as an opening-sheltering, and thus as earth upon and through which a holy-dwelling is solidly and perennially instituted, is to let oneself be brought into language by language itself, its voice and its ways.

The naming of voice is not incidental. Voice is not just a by-product of language, it is of its very essence and determines the mode of its

(18) For this memoria and a recent excellent account of Augustine’s interiority, see Jean-Louis Chrétien, L’espace intérieur (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 2014), 51-74. For further analysis of the notion of “recueillement” with its link to gathering and continentia/conscientia, see page 54 of the same book.
(19) Heidegger, GA, Bd. 9, 313.
(20) On language as ‘gathering (Sammeln)’ and its kinship to ‘harvest (Lese)’, see “Vom Wesen und Begriff der phusis”, GA, Bd. 39, 278-9.
deployment, its gathering as preserving–its secrecy and mystery (Geheimnis)—and its establishment of a world as Dasein answers its call. The voice says, it is each time a saying of the earth, of origin. As such it allows for what Heidegger names Mundart. It is not just an ‘accent’ but, literally, a way of the mouth, of speaking that is in essential belonging to the gifting of a place. It is never revealed through linguistic anthropology or a study of the articulations of the mouth and the different speech organs and their movements. Rather, it allows the earth to sway (wesen) in its peculiar way. This language, which we call, I would contend inadequately in some regards, a dialect, or the Arabic ‘ammiyya (عامة), i.e. what is general, is not what is merely of the common people, it is also and especially what the earth as ground and grounding finds as its essential expression through human Dasein. Once one is enowned to it, he/she builds on a solid foundation. We may understand, in this light, what the Lebanese sociologist-historian Nassif Nassar, for example, says, quoting the 19th century Arabic Renaissance figure Boutros al-Boustani: “A united family, has ‘the homeland as father and the earth as mother’. Earth and homeland constitute the first level of union”, and reminding us of the importance al-Boustani laid on language, in association with the earth. The reader can see clearly now why the so-called everyday language is to be understood or even recuperated, and realises that it determines a people ontologically and is of utmost relevance if its members wish to dwell in a sure, safe and lasting manner.


(22) ناصيف نصار، “خروج من القرون الوسطى”, نحو مجتمع جديد: مقدّمات أساسية في نقد المجتمع الطائفي، بيروت، لبنان، دار النهار، 1970، ص.25.


(23) Ibid., 27, 28.
We reach then a new determination that ought to be the foundation for a new thinking on language, and particularly on dialect as *Mundart*, way of the mouth but also the body, movement and dwelling. The following delimitations determine the essence of language, its sway and its unfolding and/or what it unfolds:

- It is a being-historical saying: it is a people’s way of being as historical. It is not its members as subjects of history, nor as objects of history, but as history itself.
- It is the unfolding of a specific world, in its very distinctive openings and closings, through word, voice and letter.
- It is the word of earth, of the land swaying as homeland and allowing the foundation of a place where people are at home.
- It is then a people’s dwelling – each one dwells in language, in its voice, in its ways whose presence is specific to a land and manifests differently for different peoples. Thus for example, in Lebanon, it unfolds in the mountain paths and bypaths or those one may still follow in their purposeful-aimless ways, much like the Heideggerian *Holzwege*. It is a (people’s) geography.
- Language is the continuous possibility and actuality of strife between heaven and earth, the transcendent and the immanent-thanatic; and in this very strife it constitutes the renegotiated institution of the religious and the sheltering-opening that is specific to its people.
- Within such sheltering-opening, language is "the house of being", of being-historical and of being-with. It speaks from within the ground of holy mourning-with. Only as such can it keep the humans it constantly calls toward itself whole and safe, for as long as they heed its beckoning in all its aspects and ways of being.

We may understand now how language holds a holy dimension that, once absent, once earth in its opening and closing and heaven—the specific and the universal of the divinity—are not held together, it is reduced to a mere means of communication. Language is where a meeting of the gods and humans is made possible, where holiness opens
unto the heavens\(^{24}\). We may understand then, to end, the role of poetry, of the poet, whom we may call, with Heidegger, the half-god, the one participating in the earthly and the godly, the one who is the messenger of both as the word of language. Such half-gods allow us, as the saying of poesy, to renew or, more precisely, to have a previously covered-up relation to language and to thus answer its call in a new fashion that will lead people in a war-torn country to truly mourn and suffer together in the way I laid out above.

Only now can we understand what a return to the ownmost language is all about. It is not just leaving any kind of foreign country or foreign language, whatever it may be, and coming home, but a going into the essence of language as a mourning and as the ground of a mourning-with.

Such a new enowning of people walking on the ruins of war will lead, to be fostered, to specific institutions where more than a mere surface reconciliation is achieved. A new way of cohesion, of being-together, a care, is to be made possible through them, founded on a thinking emerging from a fundamental attunement, a mourning-together. We may then say: We are a discourse, \textit{Wir sind Gespräch}\(^{25}\). Of these institutions much may be said, and this paper ends then on a call for a political questioning.

\(^{24}\) Heidegger, \textit{GA, Bd. 9}, 182.
\(^{25}\) Ibid., 68.