Passages on Ereignis:

The question of being is the question of the truth of be-ing. When accomplished and grasped as it historically unfolds, it becomes the grounding-question-over against the hitherto "guiding-question" of philosophy, which has been the question about beings. [§2]

…the distress of the abandonment by being…does not first need help but must itself become first of all the helping one. But this distress must still be experienced. And what if man has become hardened against this distress and, as it seems, is as stubborn as ever? Then those must come who awaken, who in the end maintain that they have discovered distress because they know that they suffer distress. **The awakening of this distress is the first displacing of man into that between [Zwischen] where chaos drives forth at the same time as god remains in flight**. This "between" is, however, not a "transcendence" with reference to man. Rather, it is the opposite: that open which to man belongs as the founder and preserver wherein as Da-sein he is en-owned by be-ing itself-be-ing that holds sway as nothing other than enowning. [§7]

Enowning owns god over to man in that enowning owns man to god. This "owning-to" that "owns-over" is enowning, wherein the truth of be-ing as Da-sein is grounded (as transformed, man is shifted into the dedsion to be-there and to be-away [Da-sein und Weg-sein]) and wherein history takes its other beginning from be-ing. [§7]

Enowning is the between with regard to the passing of god and the history of man. But this between is not some indifferent intermediate field. Rather, the relation to the passing is the opening of the cleavage used by god; and the relation to man is the enowning-letting-spring-forth of the grounding of Da-sein and thus the necessity of sheltering the truth of be-ing that is in beings as a restoring of beings. [§7]

The flight of gods must be experienced and endured. This steadfast enduring grounds the most remote nearness to enowning. This enowning is the truth of be-ing.
The distress of the abandonment by being first opens up in this truth. The grounding of the truth of be-ing, the grounding of Da-sein, becomes necessary from within this distress. This necessity is accomplished in the ongoing decision which runs through everything that is historical in man: whether in the future man belongs to the truth of being-and thus, from within and for this belongingness, shelters the truth as what holds true in beings—**or whether the beginning of the last man drives man into a deranged animality and refuses to grant the last god to historical man**. [§8]

Be-ing (as enowning) needs beings so that be-ing may hold sway.

Beings do not need be-ing in the same way. Beings can still "be" in the abandonment of being, under whose dominance the immediate availability and usefulness and serviceability of every kind (e.g., everything must serve the people) obviously make up what is a being and what is not. [§10]

Reservedness [**Gelassenheit**] as origin of stillness and as law of the gathering. The gathering [gathers] in the stillness and [is] the sheltering of truth. Sheltering of truth and its unfolding [unfolds] into the caring-for and dealing with [things].
Reservedness as openness for the reticent nearness of the essential swaying of be-ing, tuning to the remotest enquivering of hints that enown from the distance of what is undecidable.
Reservedness and seeking; the highest find in seeking itself [is] the nearness to decision.
Reservedness: the self-restraining leaping forth into the turning of enowning (thus neither a romantic flight nor a bourgeois repose). [§13]

The style of reservedness [Gelassenheit] is the remembering awaiting of enowning, because reservedness thoroughly attunes the inabiding. This reservedness also thoroughly attunes every strifing of the strife between world and earth. [§31]

The nearing and flight, arrival and departure, or the simple staying away of gods; for us in being master, i.e., as the beginning and being master over this happening, this inceptual mastery of the end will show itself as the last god. In its hinting, being itself, enowning as such, first lights up; and this lighting-up needs the grounding of the essential sway of truth as clearing and sheltering-concealing and [needs) their final sheltering in the altered shapes of beings. [§32]

When we speak of man's relation to be-ing and vice versa of be-ing's relation to man, then this easily sounds as if be-ing holds sway for man like an over-against and an object. But man as Da-sein is en-owned by be-ing as enowning and thus belongs to enowning itself. [§136]

Be-ing—rather, the essential swaying—is that out of and back to which a being as a being is above all unconcealed and sheltered and comes to be (cf. Grounding on truth). The question concerning the difference between being and beings has here a character that is totally different from the one in the questioning domain of the guiding-question (ontology). The notion of "ontological difference" is only preparatory, as crossing from the guiding-question to the grounding-question. The truth of be-ing, in and as which its essential swaying is sheltered in enopening, is enowning. And this is at the same time the essential swaying of truth as such. In the turning of enowning, the essential swaying of truth is at the same time the truth of the essential swaying. And this counter-turning itself belongs to be-ing as such. The question, Why is there truth at all as clearing sheltering-concealing? presupposes the truth of the why. But both, truth and the why (the call for grounding), are the same. Essential swaying is the truth that belongs to be-ing and springs from be-ing. [§137]

Be-ing as en-owning. En-ownment determines man as owned by be-ing….
Of course, enowning dare not ever be represented immediately objectively. Enownment is the counter resonance between man and gods-and it is precisely this between and its essential swaying which is founded by and in Da-sein.
God is neither “a being .. nor a “not-being"—and also not commensurate with be-ing. Rather be-ing holds sway, temporally-spatially, as that “between" [Zwischen) that can never be grounded in god but also not in man as extant and living—but in Da-sein.
Be-ing and the essential swaying of its truth belongs to man insofar as he becomes inabiding as Da-sein. But this also immediately means that be-ing does not hold sway by the graces of man, by the fact that man only happens to be. Be-ing “belongs" to man, so much so that man is needed by be-ing itself as the preserver of the site for the moment of the fleeing and arrival of gods. [§143]

But here, considering the extremeness of this matter, the word needs vigor; and essential swaying should not name something that yet again lies beyond be-ing but rather what brings its innermost to word: en-owning, that counter-resonance of be-ing and Da-sein in which both are not extant poles but pure and deep resonance itself. [§164]

Da-sein means en-ownment in enowning as in the essential sway of be-ing. But be-ing comes to truth only on the ground of Da-sein. [§168]

It belongs to the most unbending rigor of the inner resonance of Da-sein that it does not count gods and also does not count on them, and does not even reckon with an individual god. [§169]

However, mindful deliberation on the t/here [Da] as clearing for self-sheltering-concealing (be-ing) must already intimate how decisive the relation of Da-sein to beings in the whole is, because the t/here (Da] sustains the truth of being. Thought in this direction, Da-sein—itself nowhere placeable—moves away from the relation to man and reveals itself as the “between" [Zwischen] that is unfolded by be-ing itself as the domain where beings tower up, where above all a being returns to itself. The t/here [Da] is enowned by be-ing itself; and. consequently, man. As guardian of the truth of be-ing and thus belonging to Da-sein, is enowned in an outstanding and unique way. Thus as soon as a first allusion to Da-sein succeeds, the essential dimension which is announced in this allusion must be granted: that Da-sein is enowned by be-ing and that be-ing as enowning itself builds the midpoint of all thinking. [§175]

In this way Da-sein is the between [das Zwischen] between man (as history-grounding) and gods (in their history). The between [Zwischen] [is] not one that first ensues from the relation of gods to humans, but rather that between [Zwischen] which above all grounds the time-space for the

relation, in that it itself leaps forth into the essential swaying of be-ing as enowning and, as self-opening midpoint, makes gods and humans decidable for one another. [§191]

As essential swaying of Da-sein, selfhood springs forth from the origin of Da-sein. And the origin of the self is own-hood [Eigen-tum], [as in “own-dom"] when this word is taken in the same way as the word king-dom [Fursten-tum]. Mastery of owning [Eignung] in enowning. Own Ing is both owning-to and owning-over-to. Insofar as Da-sein is owned-to itself as belonging to en owning. it comes to itself. but never in such a manner as if the self were already an extant stock that has just not yet been reached. Rather Da-sein first comes to itself when owning-to the belongingness becomes at the same time owning-over-to enowning. Da-sein means steadfastness of the t/here [Da]. The own-hood as mastery of owning occurs in the joinedness of owning-to and owning-over-to. [§197]

En-ownment in its turning *[Kehre]* is made up neither solely of the call nor solely of the belongingness, is in neither of the two and yet resonates deeply in both. And the enquivering of this resonance in the turning of enowning is the most hidden essential sway of be-ing. This sheltering-concealing needs the deepest clearing: Be-ing "needs” Da-sein. Truth never "is” but rather holds sway. For truth is truth of be-ing, which "merely” holds sway….
The t/here (Da] holds sway; and, as that which holds sway, it must be simultaneously taken over in a being: Da-sein. Therefore, the inabiding sustaining of the essential swaying of the truth of be-ing. This twofoldness*[Zwiespältigkeit]* [is] the riddle. Therefore **Da-sein [is] the "between” [*das Zwischen*] between *be-ing and a being***. [§217]

Strife as strife of earth and world, because [it is] relation of truth *to* a being! [§221]

Therefore, truth is never only clearing, but also holds sway as sheltering-concealing, equally originarily and intimately along with clearing. Both, clearing and sheltering-concealing, are not two but rather the essential swaying of the one, of truth itself. In that truth holds sway and becomes truth, enowning becomes truth. [§225]

How would it be if nonetheless we came into the nearness of enowning, which might be obscured in its essential sway but still shows that a between [Zwischen] holds sway, between us and be-ing, and that this between itself belongs to the essential swaying of be-ing? [§236]

However, hesitating refusal itself has this originarily unifying joining of not-granting and hesitating from the hint. This hint is the self-enopening of what shelters and conceals itself as such and indeed the self-enopening for and as en-ownment, as call to belongingness to cnowning itself, i.e., to the grounding of Da-sein as the domain of decision for be-ing.
But this hint comes to hint only in the echo of be-ing out of the distress of abandonment by being, and only means further that enowning opens up neither from within the call nor

from within a belongingness but only from within the "between" [Zwichen] that resonates both. [§242]

Sheltering is basically preserving enowning by strifing of strife. Preserving self-sheltering-concealing (hesitating refusal) is no mere preserving of a given but a binding that projeds-open into what is open, bestrifing the strife, in whose steadfastness belongingness to enowning is enstrifed. [§246]

Da-sein: What is it other than **grounding the being of these beings, grounding the being of the ones to come who belong to the last god**? What is ownmost to a people is grounded in the historicity of those who belong to themselves out of belongingness to god. From within enowning, wherein this belongingness is historically grounded, first arises the foundation for why “life” and body, procreation and sex, and lineage—said fundamentally: the earth—belong to history and in their own way again take history back into themselves, and in all of that only the strife of earth and world, born up by the innermost deep awe of always being unconditioned. For what is their ownmost is always near to enowning because inherently bound to strife.

This god will set up the simplest but utmost opposition over its people as the paths on which this people wanders beyond itself, in order to find once again what is its ownmost and to exhaust the moment of its history.
World and earth in their strife will raise love and death into their utmost and will bring love and death together into fidelity to god and will withstand the maze—in the manifold mastering of the truth of beings.
The ones who are to come and belong to the last god will enstrife enowning in the strifing of this strife and, in the widest retrospect, will remind themselves of the greatest thing that is created: the enfilled onceness and uniqueness of being. Next to it the massive will release all rankings of its raving and will carry off all that is insecure and half-way, all that consoles itself merely with the heretofore. **Will then the time of gods be up and the relapse into the mere living of beings who are world-poor begin, for whom earth remains only something to be exploited?**
Reservedness and reticence in silence will be the innermost feast of the last god; they will achieve their own way of entrusting the simplicity of things and their own surging of the intimacy of charming-moving unto removal-unto of their works; the sheltering of truth will leave sheltered and concealed what is most sheltered-concealed and will thus lend to it the uniquely present…
Those few to come count among themselves **the essentially unpretentious ones, to whom no publicness belongs but who in their inner beauty gather the shining-ahead of the last god and then gift it to the few and the rare by radiating it back to them**. They all ground Da-sein, through which the accord of the nearness of god resonates. a nearness which neither rises above itself nor fades away but has taken the steadiness of the deepest awe for the most singular space

of resonance. Da-sein- shifting through all relations of remoteness and nearness (onset) of the last god. [§251-2]

What is this originary turning in enowning? Only the onset of be-ing as enownment of the t/here [Da] leads Da-sein to itself and thus to the enactment (sheltering) of the inabiding and grounded truth into a being which finds its site in the lit-up sheltering-concealing of the t/here [Da)….
When through enowning, Da-sein—as the open midpoint of the self hood that grounds truth—is thrown unto itself and becomes a self, then Dasein as the sheltered possibility of grounding the essential swaying of be-ing must in return belong to enowning. And within the turning:
Enowning must need Dasein and, needing it, must place it into the call and so bring it before the passing of the last god….
The hints of the last god are at play in the turning as onset and staying-away of the arrival and flight of gods and their places of mastery. [§255]

The last god has its essential swaying within the hint, the onset and staying away of the arrival as well as the flight of the gods who have been, and within their sheltered and hidden transformation. **The last god is not enowning itself; rather, it needs enowning as that to which the founder of the t/here [Dagründer] belongs**.
This hint, as enowning, places a being into the utmost abandonment by being and at the same time radiates the truth of being as the inner most shining of that abandonment…Here the innermost finitude of be-ing reveals itself: in the hint of the last god…. [§256]

The last god is the beginning of the longest history on its shortest path. Long preparation is needed for the great moment of its passing. [§256]

Enowning is:
I. en-ownment, namely that, in **the needfulness out of which gods need be-ing**, this be-ing necessitates Da-sein unto the grounding of be-ing's own truth and thus lets **the "between" [Zwischen), the en-ownment of Dasein by gods and owning of gods to themselves, hold sway as en-owning**.
2. The enowning of en-ownment gathers within itself the de-cision [Ent-scheidung]: that freedom, as the ground that holds to abground, **lets a distress emerge from out of which, as from out of the overflow of the ground, gods and man come forth into partedness**.
3. En-ownment as de-cision brings to the parted ones countering, namely that this "toward-each-other" of the broadest needful de-cision must stand in the utmost "counter." because it bridges over the abground of the needed be-ing.
4. Countering is the origin of the strife, which holds sway by setting a being free from its lostness in mere beingness. Setting-free distinguishes en-owning in its relation to a being as such. En-ownment of Da-sein lets Da-sein become inabiding in what is non-ordinary vis-a-vis every kind of being.

5. But setting free, grasped out of the clearing of the t/here [Da], is simultaneously the withdrawal of enowning, namely that it withdraws from any re-presenting-calculation and holds sway as refusal.
6. As richly enjoined and without image as be-ing holds sway. Nevertheless it rests in itself and in its simpleness. **It is possible that the character of the "between" [Zwischen] (between gods and man) might mislead into taking be-ing as mere relation and as consequence and result of the relation of what is in relation**. But en-owning is this relating—if this designation is even possible-that first brings those in relation to themselves in order to lay their needfulness and guardianship into the open of the countering-parted ones, which the ones in relation do not first take on as property but rather out of which they draw what is their ownmost. **Be-ing is the distress of gods; and, as this distressing of Dasein, it is more of an abground** than anything that may be called a being and that no longer can be named by be-ing. **Be-ing is needed, is the needfulness of gods**, and **yet is not to be derived from them. Rather it is the other way around**: be-ing is superior to them, in the ab-groundness of its essential sway as ground. Be-ing enowns Da-sein and yet is not its origin. As the ground of the countering ones in it, the "between" [Zwischen] holds sway unmediated. This determines its simpleness, which is not emptiness but rather the ground of the fullness which springs forth from the countering as strife. [§257]

Enowning always means **enowning as en-ownment, de-cision, countering, setting-free, withdrawal, simpleness, uniqueness, aloneness**….
By remembering **the old distinctions (being and becoming)—which were still prevailing, up to their end in Nietzsche**—one might likewise want to take the determination of be-ing as enowning as an interpretation of being as "becoming" ("life," "movement"). Not to mention at all the unavoidable fall back into metaphysics and the dependency of representations of "movement," "life," and "becoming" from being as beingness, such an interpretation of enowning would completely tum away from enowning, since such an interpretation makes assertions about enowning as an object, instead of letting this essential swaying—and only it—speak, so that thinking remain a thinking of be-ing which does not make assertions about be-ing, but rather says in a saying that belongs to the en-said and repels all objectification and falsification—into what is static (or "what is flowing")—because **with such assertions the dimension of re-presentation is immediately entered** and the non-ordinariness of be-ing is denied. [§267]

Thus, **when be-ing is thought as the "between" into [Zwischen] which gods are distressed, so that it is a distress for man, then gods and man cannot be taken as "given" or "extant**."
In the projecting-open of that thinking, god and man are taken over—each differently—as what is historical, which itself first comes into its essential swaying from out of enowning of the "between" [Zwischen]. But this means that each comes to its essential swaying for the struggle for what is its ownmost, for the steadfastness of deciding for one of the hidden possibilities.

"Man" and "god" are word-hulls without history if the truth of be-ing in them is not brought to language. Be-ing holds sway as the "between" [Zwischen] for god and man, but in such a way that this between-space [Zwischenraum] first grants essential possibility for god and man. [§267]

History *[Geschichte)* is not the exclusive right of man but rather the essential sway of be-ing itself. History alone is in play in the "between *[Zwischen]* of the countering of gods and man as the ground of the strife of world and earth; history is nothing other than enownment of this "between ... [§267]

But why precisely this strife of world and earth? Because in en-owning Da-sein is enowned and becomes the inabiding of man. Because from the whole of beings *man* is called to guardianship of be-ing. [§269]

The "between" [das Zwischen] is the simple "bursting open" that enowns be-ing to a being, which up until then is held back from what is ownmost to it and is not yet to be named a being. This "bursting open" is the clearing for the sheltered. But the "bursting open" does not disperse, and the clearing is not a mere emptiness. The "between" [das Zwischen] which bursts open gathers what it removes into the open of its strifing and refusing belongingness, moves unto the ab-ground, out of which everything (god, man, world, earth) recoils in swaying into itself and thus leaves to be-ing the unique decidedness of en-ownment. Be-ing of such essential swaying is itself unique in this essential sway. For it holds sway as that thrust that has perhaps already announced itself as the utmost possibility of decision for Western history, the possibility that be-ing itself arises from such a holding-sway as the needfulness of god, who needs the guardianship of man. This possibility is itself the origin "of" be-ing. [§270]

Be-ing is the enstrifing enownment which originarily gathers its enowned (Da-sein of man) and its refused (god) into the abground of its "between" in whose clearing world and earth enstrife the [Zwischen], belongingness of what is their ownmost to the free-play of time-space, in which what is true comes to be preserved-what as "a being" in such preserving finds itself in be-ing (in enowning) for the simpleness of its ownmost. To say be-ing in this way does not mean to manufacture a conceptual determination but rather to prepare an attuning for the leap…
…to protect the midpoint of the "between" [Zwischen] which becomes for gods the unintended but still, necessary abode, but for humans the free of the preserving of that which, earth wise and worldly, preserves what is true and arises and disappears as a being in this freedom. [§270]

Da-sein is what is enowned in enowning. [§271]

[End Passages]