EDMUND HUSSERL

—

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY AND THE CONFRONTATION WITH HEIDEGGER (1927–1931)

TRANSLATED AND EDITED BY

THOMAS SHEEHAN AND RICHARD E. PALMER

SPRINGER-SCIENCE+BUSINESS MEDIA, B.V.

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY AND THE CONFRONTATION WITH HEIDEGGER (1927–1931)

EDMUND HUSSERL

COLLECTED WORKS

TRANSLATORS AND EDITORS:
THOMAS SHEEHAN AND RICHARD E. PALMER

VOLUME VI

VOLUME I	Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy THIRD BOOK: Phenomenology and the Foundations of the Sciences
VOLUME II	Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy FIRST BOOK: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology
VOLUME III	Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy SECOND BOOK: Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution
VOLUME IV	On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)
VOLUME V	Early Writings in the Philosophy of Logic and Mathematics
VOLUME VI	Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology and Confrontation with Heidegger (1927–1931)

TRANSLATIONS
PREPARED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE HUSSERL-ARCHIVES (LEUVEN)

EDMUND HUSSERL

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY AND THE CONFRONTATION WITH HEIDEGGER (1927–1931)

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article,
The Amsterdam Lectures,
"Phenomenology and Anthropology"
and
Husserl's Marginal Notes
in
Being and Time
and
Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

THOMAS SHEEHAN AND RICHARD E. PALMER

SPRINGER-SCIENCE+BUSINESS MEDIA, B.V.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available.

ISBN 978-90-481-9922-8 ISBN 978-90-481-9923-5 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9923-5

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved

© 1997 Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht
Originally published by Kluwer Academic Publishers in 1997
No part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

Dedicated to
PROFESSOR SAMUEL IJSSELING
Colleague and friend
in respect and gratitude

CONTENTS

PREFACE:
Thomas Sheehan and Richard E. Palmer xi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xvii

GENERAL INTRODUCTION:
Husserl and Heidegger: The Making and Unmaking of a Relationship
Thomas Sheehan 1

PART ONE
THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE
(1927–1928)

INTRODUCTION:
The History of the Redaction of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article
Thomas Sheehan 35

Appendix: The Manuscripts of the EB article
Thomas Sheehan 69

EDMUND HUSSERL: THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA ARTICLE

Editorial Notes on the Present Edition of the EB Article 80

Draft A
translated by Thomas Sheehan 83

Draft B ("Attempt at a Second Draft")
and Martin Heidegger, Letter to Husserl, October 22, 1927,
with appendices
translated by Thomas Sheehan 107

Draft C, Selections
translated by Thomas Sheehan 147

Draft D
translated by Richard E. Palmer 159

Draft E
edited and translated by Christopher V. Salmon 181

PART TWO
THE AMSTERDAM LECTURES
(1928)

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE AMSTERDAM LECTURES
Richard E. Palmer 199

THE AMSTERDAM LECTURES <ON> PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY
translated by Richard E. Palmer 213

PART THREE
HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS ON HEIDEGGER'S WORKS

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER,
BEING AND TIME
Editorial Introduction
Thomas Sheehan 258

Husserl's Marginal Remarks in Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*
newly edited from the original notes and translated by
Thomas Sheehan 263

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER,
KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF METAPHYSICS
An Introduction to Husserl's Marginal Remarks in *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*
Richard E. Palmer 424

Editorial Introduction 435

Husserl's Marginal Remarks on *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*
translated by Richard E. Palmer 437

PART FOUR
APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE
"For Edmund Husserl on his Seventieth Birthday" (April 8, 1929) by Martin Heidegger
translated by Thomas Sheehan 475

APPENDIX TWO
Letter to Alexander Pfänder (January 6, 1931) by Edmund Husserl
translated by Burt C. Hopkins 479

APPENDIX THREE
Edmund Husserl: "Phenomenology and Anthropology" (June, 1931)
translated by Thomas Sheehan and Richard E. Palmer 485

INDEX 501

PREFACE

Thomas Sheehan and Richard E. Palmer

The materials translated in the body of this volume date from 1927 through 1931. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica Article* and the *Amsterdam Lectures* were written by Edmund Husserl (with a short contribution by Martin Heidegger) between September 1927 and April 1928, and Husserl's marginal notes to *Sein und Zeit* and *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* were made between 1927 and 1929. The appendices to this volume contain texts from both Husserl and Heidegger, and date from 1929 through 1931. As a whole these materials not only document Husserl's thinking as he approached retirement and emeritus status (March 31, 1928) but also shed light on the philosophical chasm that was widening at that time between Husserl and his then colleague and protégé, Martin Heidegger.

1. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica Article*

Between September and early December 1927, Husserl, under contract, composed an introduction to phenomenology that was to be published in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1929). Husserl's text went through four versions (which we call Drafts A, B, C, and D) and two editorial condensations by other hands (which we call Drafts E and F). Throughout this volume those five texts as a whole are referred to as "the EB Article" or simply "the Article."

Husserl's own final version of the Article, Draft D, was never published during his lifetime; the German edition of it appeared only in 1962.[1] However, in its 14th edition the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* did publish, over the signature "E. Hu.," a 4000-word article entitled "Phenomenology." However, that essay, which was done into English by Dr. Christopher V. Salmon of Oxford, is not a translation so much as a paraphrase of Husserl's 7000-word fourth and

[1] The German edition of Draft D of the EB Article was first published in Edmund Husserl, *Phänomenologische Psychologie: Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1925*, ed. Walter Biemel, Husserliana: Gesammelte Werke, vol. IX, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962; 2nd edition, 1968; "Ergänzende Texte, A. Abhandlungen," pp. 277–301. This German edition is hereinafter abbreviated as "*Hu* IX" followed by the page number.

final draft of the EB Article, and an unreliable paraphrase at that. It is true that Husserl did commission Dr. Salmon to cut that fourth and final draft in half (since it was twice the length that the *Britannica* had requested) and to translate the result into English. It is not at all clear, however, that Husserl licensed Salmon's gross paraphrase and rearrangement of his text. Scholars have long challenged the legitimacy of designating Salmon's published version of the EB Article a "text by Husserl." The English Article has been called, at the kindest, a "very free" translation (Biemel), and has been characterized, less kindly, as full of "amazing statements," a "wild paraphrase of Husserl's text," and thus a mere "semblance" of the German original (Spiegelberg).[2] The 1962 publication of the complete German text of Husserl's fourth draft finally restored the EB Article to its rightful place in Husserl's corpus.[3]

The present volume provides complete translations of all Husserl's drafts of the Article except Draft C, which, to avoid repetition, appears here only in part. Draft E – Salmon's unfortunate condensation and "translation" of the Draft D – is also reprinted here as it left his hand and before it too was cut back by the editors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Included as well are:

- Heidegger's notes and comments on Husserl's Drafts A and B of the Article,
- the pages that Heidegger contributed to the Draft B of the Article, and
- Heidegger's October 22, 1927, letter to Husserl about Draft B.

2. *The Amsterdam Lectures*

Early in 1928 Husserl composed two linked lectures, one on phenomenological psychology and the other on the relation of pure psychology to transcendental phenomenology. He drafted the lectures in Göttingen between April 7 and April 17, 1928[4] and delivered them to the *Amsterdamse Vereniging voor Wijsbegeerte* (Amsterdam Philosophical Society) on April 23 and 29, 1928. Hereinafter these two lectures taken together are referred to as "the Amsterdam Lectures" or simply "the Lectures."[5]

The EB Article and the Amsterdam Lectures were completed within five months of each other (December 1927 and April 1928, respectively) and are

---

[2] Herbert Spiegelberg, "On the Misfortunes of Edmund Husserl's *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article 'Phenomenology,'" *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 2 (1971), 74–76.

[3] Richard E. Palmer's translation of Draft D made the full, original text available in English: "'Phenomenology,' Edmund Husserl's Article for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1927): A New, Complete Translation," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 2 (1971), 77–90.

[4] *Hu* IX, p. 617

[5] *Hu* IX, p. 302–49.

closely related in organization, content, and style. Both were intended as general introductions to phenomenology, and both carry out this task by discussing pure phenomenological psychology as a propaedeutic to transcendental phenomenological philosophy. In that latter sense, both the EB Article and the Amsterdam Lectures constitute a third approach to transcendental phenomenology – via phenomenological psychology – as distinct from the "Cartesian" and the "ontological" (or "Kantian") approaches.[6]

There is ample evidence that Husserl considered the Amsterdam Lectures to be only a further, expanded version of the EB Article. Soon after completing the final draft of the Article, Husserl spoke of fleshing it out and publishing it in his own journal.[7] As it happened, Husserl never got around to publishing this "expanded version" of the EB Article; instead, it became the Amsterdam Lectures of April 1928, which he described as a "reworking of the typed draft for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*."[8] It is legitimate, then, to consider the Amsterdam Lectures as Husserl's final effort to refine the EB Article and to produce an introductory text on how phenomenological psychology can serve as a propaedeutic to transcendental phenomenology.

3. *Husserl's Marginal Notes on Heidegger's* Sein und Zeit *and* Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik

Between April 1927 and September 1929 Husserl read twice[9] through Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* (published in early April 1927), and in the summer

---

[6] See Iso Kern, *Husserl und Kant: Eine Untersuchung über Husserls Verhältnis zu Kant und zum Neukantianismus*, Phaenomenologica 16, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964, pp. 194–238; also his "The Three Ways to the Transcendental Phenomenological Reduction in the Philosophy of Edmund Husserl," in Frederick A. Elliston and Peter McCormick, eds., *Husserl: Expositions and Appraisals*, South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977, 126–149.

[7] For example: **(1)** On December 8, 1927, Husserl wrote to Heidegger: "An expanded version, which takes into consideration a topic that went untreated – the double meaning of psychology: as naturalistic and as humanistically oriented (my old antithesis) – should go into the *Jahrbuch* as an introduction to further publications." *Briefwechsel* IV, p, 149. **(2)** A few weeks later (December 26, 1927) Husserl wrote to Roman Ingarden: "[The EB Article] should appear in an expanded form in the next volume of the *Jahrbuch*. I would like to shape the Article in such a way that it serves to some extent as a useful guide for the series of publications to follow...." *Briefwechsel* III, p. 237. **(3)** On May 9, 1928, shortly after delivering the Lectures, Husserl told Heidegger: "I worked out my Holland lectures on the basis of the so-called *Encyclopaedia* article," *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 154; and **(4)** to Ingarden he described the content of the Lectures as "the more fully developed [explicierte], and also improved, line of thought that was set down for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*." *Briefwechsel* III, p. 241 (July 13, 1928). For *Briefwechsel*, see note 13, below.

[8] Husserl wrote at the head of his manuscript of the Lectures: "Diese Überarbeitung des Entwurfs in Schreibmaschine für die Encyclopaedia Britannica...": *Hu* IX, pp. 615 and 617.

[9] Fritz Heinemann, *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*, New York: Harper & Row, 1953, p. 48; information from Husserl, 1931.

of 1929 he also studied Heidegger's *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*,[10] which had just appeared. These readings made it clear to Husserl how different Heidegger's work was from his own, and the margins of Husserl's personal copies of the two works are filled with notes, queries, and marks, most of them quite critical of Heidegger's work. Husserl's marginal notes to both works are translated in Part Three below. The translation of the notes to *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* follows the German edition of those notes published by Roland Breeur in 1994, whereas the notes to *Sein und Zeit* are newly edited from the pages of Husserl's copy of that book.[11]

4. *The Appendices*

The appendices present translations of texts by Heidegger and Husserl dating from 1929 through 1931:

- Heidegger's brief speech in honor of Husserl, delivered on April 8, 1929, at the combined celebrations of Husserl's seventieth birthday and his achievement of emeritus status at Freiburg University;
- Husserl's letter to Alexander Pfänder, January 6, 1931, which remarks upon Heidegger.
- Husserl's lecture "Phenomenology and Anthropology," delivered in June of 1931, in which he criticizes Heidegger and others.

The accompanying chart provides some general and preliminary information on the texts in this volume. The chart presents the texts in chronological order of composition (the exception is Heidegger's speech of April 8, 1929), along with publication and translation data. More detailed information on these texts is provided later in this volume.

---

[10] Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, Erste Hälfte, Sonderdruck aus *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, Band VII [sic], Halle a.d. Saale, Niemeyer 1927; and *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1929.

[11] The German edition of the marginal notes is "Randbemerkungen Husserls zu Heideggers *Sein und Zeit* und *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*," ed. Roland Breeur, *Husserl Studies* 11, 1 (1994), 3–36; notes to *Sein und Zeit*, pp. 9–48; notes to *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, pp. 49–63. Husserl's copy of *Sein und Zeit* is catalogued as BP 78 at the Husserl-Archives, Leuven.

OVERVIEW OF THE TEXTS IN THIS VOLUME

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article

Draft A

author:	Husserl, September 1927
German text:	*Hu* IX, pp. 237–55, 592–5
translation:	the entire text, by Thomas Sheehan

Draft B

authors:	Husserl and Heidegger, October 10–21, 1927
German text:	*Hu* IX, pp. 256–77, with pp. 595–9
translation:	the entire text, by Thomas Sheehan

Heidegger's letter to Husserl, with appendices:

author:	Heidegger, October 22, 1927
German text:	*Hu* IX, pp. 600–3
translation:	the entire text, by Thomas Sheehan

Draft C, selections

author:	Husserl, late October, 1927
German text:	*Hu* IX, pp. 517–9 (introduction), pp. 519–26 (conclusion), 591 and 645 (footnotes)
translation:	by Thomas Sheehan

Draft D

author:	Husserl, late October to December 8, 1927
German text:	*Hu* IX, pp. 277–301
translation:	the entire text, by Richard E. Palmer

Salmon's edition the EB Article:

author:	Christopher V. Salmon, editing Husserl, December 1927–February 1928.
English text:	Husserl-Archives, Leuven, M III 10 II 1.

The Amsterdam Lectures

author:	Husserl, March–April, 1928
German text:	*Hu* IX, pp. 302–49, 615–24
translation:	the entire text, by Richard E. Palmer

Husserl's Marginalia

To *Sein und Zeit*

author:	Husserl, April 1927 through September 1929
German text:	Husserl's copy of *Sein und Zeit*, Husserl-Archives.
translation:	the entire text, by Thomas Sheehan

To *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*

author:	Husserl, August 15 through September 1929
German text:	*Husserl Studies* 11, 1 (1994), 49–63
translation:	the entire text, by Richard E. Palmer

Appendices

For Edmund Husserl on His Seventieth Birthday

author:	Heidegger, April 8, 1929
German text:	*Akademische Mitteilung*, May 14, 1929[12]
translation:	Thomas Sheehan

Letter to Alexander Pfänder

author:	Husserl, January 6, 1931
German text:	Husserl, *Briefwechsel*, II, pp. 180–184[13]
translation:	Burt C. Hopkins

Phenomenology and Anthropology

author:	Husserl, June 1931
German text:	Husserl, *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1922–1937)*, pp. 164–181[14]
translation:	Thomas Sheehan and Richard E. Palmer

---

[12] Martin Heidegger, "Edmund Husserl zum 70. Geburtstag," *Akademische Mitteilung* (Organ für die gesamten Interessen der Studentschaft von der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität in Freiburg/Br.), 4. Folge, 9. Semester, Nr. 14 (May 14, 1929), pp. 46–47.

[13] Edmund Husserl, *Briefwechsel*, Husserliana: *Dokumente*, Band III, Briefwechsel, ed. Karl Schuhmann in collaboration with Elisabeth Schuhmann, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1994; vol. II, pp. 180-184. Hereinafter, references to this ten-volume edition of Husserl's letters is given as: *Briefwechsel*, plus the volume number and the pages.

[14] Edmund Husserl, *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1922–1937)*, Husserliana *Gesammelte Werke*, XXVII, ed. Thomas Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1989, pp. 164–181, with critical notes at pp. 300–307. An earlier English translation by Richard G. Schmitt appeared in *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*, ed. Roderick M. Chisholm, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960, pp. 129–142, and in Edmund Husserl, *Shorter Works*, ed. Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston, South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1981, pp. 315–323.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors of this volume gratefully acknowledge the support and editorial advice of the staff of the Husserl-Archives, Leuven, Belgium, especially Professors Samuel IJsseling, Rudolf Bernet, and Roland Breeur; and they thank Mr Phil Johnstone and Ms Maja de Keijzer of Kluwer Academic Publishers for their superb editorial work.

Thomas Sheehan is grateful to Messrs Colin Hubbard, Daniel Price, Craig Greenman and Donald Ringelstein for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of this volume. Richard Palmer thanks the staff of the Husserl-Archives for their hospitality during his visit to the Archives to receive specific advice, and is grateful to Steven Spileers for transcribing Husserl's shorthand marginal remarks in *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik.* He also thanks MacMurray College Library for their unwavering support and the Department for general technical support services. For major financial support he thanks the Fulbright Commission for two research fellowships to study in Heidelberg, Germany, in 1991–1992 and 1995–1996. For advice and encouragement during his stay at the Philosophical Seminar of the University of Heidelberg, he thanks Professor Hans-Georg Gadamer, Reiner Wiehl, Dominic Kaegi, and Carsten Dutt. He gratefully acknowledges the constant support and encouragement at MacMurray College of his colleague and friend, Meredith Cargill. For clerical chores in connection with the index and with the reading of proofs he hastens to thank his present student assistant, Tiffany Hermon, and his former student, Elizabeth Brown of Springfield, Illinois. He also thanks the editors of *Man and World* for permission to use selected portions of his essay, "Husserl's Debate with Heidegger in the Margins *of Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*" (May 1997) to serve as a short introduction in this volume. He thanks Indiana University Press for permission to cite from Richard Taft's translation, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics.*

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

HUSSERL AND HEIDEGGER: THE MAKING AND UNMAKING OF A RELATIONSHIP

Thomas Sheehan

I. THE EARLY YEARS

Heidegger's initial contacts with Husserl's work: 1909–18
First personal encounters: 1916–17
The bond is forged: 1918
"Philosophical soulmates": The first Freiburg period: 1919–23

II. THE PARTING OF THE WAYS

Sein und Zeit, 1926–27
The writing of *Sein und Zeit*, 1926
The dedication of *Sein und Zeit*, April 1926
The publication of *Sein und Zeit*, April 1927
Adumbrations of conflict
The failed collaboration on the EB Article, October 10–22, 1927
The discussion of *Sein und Zeit*, January 1928
Heidegger's editing of Husserl's lectures on internal time-consciousness, spring-summer 1928
Heidegger's return to Freiburg (autumn, 1928) and Husserl's close reading of Heidegger's works (summer, 1929)
Dénouement: 1929 to 1931 and beyond

HUSSERL AND HEIDEGGER: THE MAKING AND UNMAKING OF A RELATIONSHIP

The long-standing relationship between Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) and Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) came to a bitter end during 1928–1929. On the philosophical level, what had initially seemed like a happy convergence of intellectual interests split apart into two very different visions of the enterprise of phenomenology. On the personal level, an apparently warm and cordial friendship suddenly turned sour and devolved into, on the one hand, Heidegger's private sneering at Husserl's "sham philosophy"[1] and, on the other, Husserl's acrimonious charges of Heidegger's deception, betrayal, and even anti-Semitism.

The factors leading to the rupture of this relationship have long been shrouded in speculation and even today are not entirely known. During the last ten years of his life Husserl avoided any noisy public display of his disappointment, just as Heidegger, right up to his own death, was equally sparing and discrete (if not always forthright) in his direct comments on Husserl. As a result, primary source documents relating to the rupture and dating from the 1920s and 1930s are relatively few, although much has been published based on the general contrasts in their positions.

Since the 1960s, however, information about the relation of the two men, and especially about Heidegger's intellectual relation to Husserl, has expanded considerably. For one thing, Heidegger towards the end of his life saw fit to remark on his relation to Husserl in a number of publications.[2] Likewise, the publication of Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe*, beginning in 1976, has made

---

[1] Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers, *Briefwechsel 1920–1963*, ed. Walter Biemel and Hans Saner, Frankfurt am Main. Vittorio Klostermann, 1990, p. 71 (December 26, 1926).

[2] Heidegger's texts include: **(1)** Letter to William J. Richardson, April 1962, in "Preface / Vorwort" to William J. Richardson, *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963, pp. vii–xxiii. **(2)** "Mein Weg in die Phänomenologie," *Zur Sache des Denkens*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1969, pp. 81–90; E.T., "My Way Into Phenomenology" in *On Time and Being*, ed. and trans. Joan Stambaugh, New York: Harper & Row, 1972. **(3)** "Nur noch ein Gott kann uns retten," *Der Spiegel*, 23 (May 31, 1976), 193–219; E.T. by William J. Richardson, "Only a God Can Save Us," in *Heidegger, the Man and the Thinker*, ed. Thomas Sheehan, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers/Transaction Publishers, 1981, pp. 45–72. See Karl Schuhmann's response to this interview: "Zu Heideggers *Spiegel*-Gespräch über Husserl," *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, 32, 4 (October–December, 1978), 591–612. **(4)** Martin Heidegger, "Seminar in Zähringen 1973" in *Vier Seminare*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977, pp. 110–138; originally published as "Le séminaire de Zähringen" in Martin Heidegger, *Questions IV*, ed. and trans. by Jean Beaufret, François Fédier, Jean Lauxerois, and Claude Roëls, Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1976, pp. 307–39. **(5)** "Über das Zeitverständnis in der Phänomenologie und im Denken der Seinsfrage" in Helmut Gehrig, ed., *Phänomenologie – lebendig oder tot?* Karlsruhe: Badenia, 1969, p. 47; E.T. "The Understanding of Time in Phenomenology and in the Thinking of the Being-Question" by Thomas Sheehan and Frederick Ellison, *The Southwestern Journal of Philosophy*, X, 2 (Summer, 1979), p. 201.

available many of the lecture courses that the young Professor Heidegger delivered at the universities of Freiburg (1919–1923) and Marburg (1923–1928).[3] A third factor was the publication in 1962 of the four drafts of Husserl's EB Article – including Heidegger's contributions to and criticisms of the project – all of which are translated in the present volume. Most recently, the publication of Husserl's massive correspondence has shed further light on the matter.[4]

This introduction covers only the very early years of Husserl and Heidegger's relationship (up to 1919) and the years when that relationship fell apart (1927–1931). The middle years (1919–1926), when Heidegger began forging his own radical version of phenomenology, is thoroughly treated in the books and articles of Theodore Kisiel, John Van Buren, and others, to which the reader is referred.[5]

I. THE EARLY YEARS

Heidegger's Initial Contacts with Husserl's Work: 1909–18

By his own account, Heidegger began reading Husserl by mistake. In the fall of 1909, at the beginning of his theology studies at Freiburg University, the twenty-year-old Heidegger was puzzling over the traditional question about the meaning of being. This was the question that, in Aristotle's formulation, concerned the analogical, πρὸς ἕν referral[6] of the multiple meanings of the participle-turned-noun ὄν (a being, an entity, whatever-is) or, equally, of the various ways that the verb εἶναι (to be) or the noun οὐσία (beingness) can be said of entities. That question, Heidegger writes, was awakened in him by Franz Brentano's *On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle*, which he first read in 1907 and which for some years afterwards, as he later remarked,

---

[3] Martin Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, various volumes, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976–.

[4] Edmund Husserl, *Briefwechsel*, 10 volumes, ed. Karl Schuhmann in collaboration with Elisabeth Schuhmann, Husserliana: Dokumente, Band III, Dordrecht / Boston / London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994. Hereinafter abbreviated as *Briefwechsel*, followed by the individual volume and page/s.

[5] Theodore Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993, pp. 480 ff., and his articles listed there at pp. 573–4, including "Why the First Draft of *Being and Time* Was Never Published," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 20/1 (January 1989), 3–22. John Van Buren, *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994. Also Thomas Sheehan, "Heidegger's Early Years: Fragments for a Philosophical Biography," in *Heidegger, the Man and the Thinker*, ed. Thomas Sheehan, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers/Transaction Publishers, 1981, pp. 3–20; "Time and Being, 1925–27," in Robert W. Shahan and J. N. Mohanty, eds., *Thinking About Being: Aspects of Heidegger's Thought*, Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1984, pp. 179–183; and "Heidegger's *Lehrjahre*," in John Sallis, Giuseppina Moneta, and Jacques Taminaux, eds., *The Collegium Phaenomenologicum*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988, pp. 77–137.

[6] Cf. for example, Aristotle, *Metaphysics, Γ*, 2, 1003 a 33 and *K*, 3, 1061 a 11.

remained "the 'rod and staff' of my first awkward attempts to penetrate into philosophy."[7] Thus, when he matriculated in theology at Freiburg University in 1909 and learned from journal articles that Brentano had taught Husserl and influenced his work, Heidegger began reading Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen* in the hopes that the work would help him solve his question about the unified meaning of being.[8]

And eventually it did. Initially, however, Heidegger's efforts came to naught, in part because Husserl's problematic simply did not coincide with Heidegger's question, and in part because Heidegger did not yet know how to use phenomenology in the service of the question about being. "My efforts [at that time] were in vain," Heidegger said late in life, "because I was not searching in the right way."[9] Heidegger simply did not know how to do phenomenology. "My basic philosophical convictions," he wrote in 1915, "remained those of Aristotelian-Scholastic philosophy."[10] Nonetheless, Heidegger was, and ever remained, drawn by Husserl's insistence on a return "*zu den Sachen selbst*," to real issues and the questions they prompted. Thus, in 1911 when he read Husserl's recently published article "Philosophy as Rigorous Science" and came to the sentence "The impulse to research must take its start not from philosophies but from issues and problems," he wrote in the margin, "We take Husserl at his word" (*"Wir nehmen Husserl beim Wort"*).[11]

When Heidegger withdrew from theological studies in 1911, he wanted to study with Husserl at the University of Göttingen, but financial difficulties prevented him from doing so.[12] Instead, from 1911 through 1913 he studied philosophy at Freiburg University under Heinrich Rickert. During those two years, as his philosophical interests broadened to include modern logic and epistemology, Heidegger had a second and more profound encounter with Husserl's *Logical Investigations*. "Rickert's seminars," Heidegger wrote in

---

[7] Franz Brentano, *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles*, Freiburg: Herder, 1862; reprinted, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960; E.T. by Rolf George, *On the Several Senses of Being in Aristotle*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975. Heidegger's remark on "rod and staff" (*Stab und Stecken*) is from "Mein Weg in die Phänomenologie", p. 81; E.T. (where it is rendered "chief help and guide"), p. 74.

[8] Edmund Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen. Erster Teil: Prolegomena zur reinen Logik*, Halle an der Salle: Max Niemeyer, 1900; *Zweiter Teil: Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*, Halle an der Salle: Max Niemeyer, 1901; new edition in Edmund Husserl, *Husserliana* vol. XIX, 1 and 2, *Logische Untersuchungen*, ed. by Elmar Holenstein (vol. XIX, 1) and Ursula Panzer (vol. XIX, 2), The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975 and 1984. E.T. by J. N. Findlay, *Logical Investigations*, two volumes, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; New York: The Humanities Press, 1970.

[9] "Mein Weg in die Phänomenologie," p. 82; E.T., p. 75.

[10] Martin Heidegger, "Curriculum Vitae, 1915," in Sheehan, "Heidegger's *Lehrjahre*," p. 79.

[11] Husserl's sentence is from "Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft," *Logos*, 1, 3 ([March] 1911), 289–341, here 341; E.T., "Philosophy as Rigorous Science," in Edmund Husserl, *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*, ed. and trans. Quentin Lauer, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965, pp. 71–147, here, p. 146. For Heidegger's remark, see Sheehan "Heidegger's *Lehrjahre*," p. 131, n. 89.

[12] Herbert Spiegelberg, *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction*, 2nd edition, vol 1, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971, p. 276.

1957, "introduced me to the writings of Emil Lask [1875–1915], who, mediating between [Husserl and Rickert], attempted to listen to the Greek thinkers as well."[13] The works of Lask that influenced Heidegger the most were *Die Logik der Philosophie und die Kategorienlehre* and *Die Logik vom Urteil*, published in, respectively, 1911 and 1912.[14] These led Heidegger to a closer study of the second volume of *Logical Investigations*, especially Husserl's treatment of evidence and truth (Investigation VI, 1/6) and his radical reinstatement of the categorial intuition (Investigation VI, 2/6).[15] Later, in *Sein und Zeit*, Heidegger would write:

> The only person who has taken up these investigations positively from outside the main stream of phenomenological research, has been E. Lask, whose *Logik der Philosophie* (1911) was as strongly influenced by the sixth *Untersuchung* ('*Über sinnliche und kategoriale Anschauungen*,' pp. 128ff. [of the second edition]) as his *Lehre vom Urteil* (1912) was influenced by the aforementioned sections on evidence and truth [namely, Investigation VI, §§ 36–39]."[16]

The categorial intuition – which Heidegger came to interpret as the immediate, experiential givenness of the being of entities – was to constitute the breakthrough that led to Heidegger's post-war discussions of the pre-thematic understanding of being. But all that lay in the future. In Heidegger's 1913 doctoral dissertation, *The Doctrine of Judgment in Psychologism*,[17] it was only Husserl's refutation of psychologism that came to expression. Likewise, although it is clear that the *Logical Investigations* had a strong influence on Heidegger's 1915 qualifying dissertation or *Habilitationsschrift*, *Duns Scotus' Doctrine of Categories and Meaning*,[18] it would nonetheless be incorrect to characterize Heidegger as a phenomenologist at this point.

---

[13] Martin Heidegger, "A Recollection (1957)," trans. Hans Seigfried in Sheehan, *Heidegger, the Man and the Thinker*, pp. 21–22, here p. 22. German text in Heidegger, *Frühe Schriften*, p. 56.

[14] Both books are reprinted in Emil Lask, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Eugen Herrigel, vol. 2, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1923, 1–282 and 283–463 respectively. See Theodore Kisiel, "Why Students of Heidegger Will Have to Read Emil Lask," in *Emil Lask and the Search for Concreteness*, ed. Deborah G. Chaffin, Athens: Ohio University Press, 1993.

[15] Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen*; in the first German edition, pp. 587–636; in the *Husserliana* edition, vol. XIX, 2, pp. 645–693; E.T. by J.N. Findlay, pp. 760–802.

[16] *Sein und Zeit*, 11th edition, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967, 218, n. 1. The translation here is taken from *Being and Time*, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, New York: Harper and Row, 1962, 493f., n. H. 218.

[17] *Die Lehre vom Urteil im Psychologismus. Ein kritisch-positiver Beitrag zur Logik*, Leipzig: Ambrosius Barth, 1914; reprinted in Martin Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, 1, *Frühe Schriften*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1978, pp. 59–188.

[18] *Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1916; reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe* 1, *Frühe Schriften*, pp. 189–411.

The First Personal Encounters, 1916–1917

Personal contacts between Husserl and Heidegger began only when Husserl transferred to Freiburg University in April of 1916, and even so until the fall of 1917 their meetings were not particularly productive. The first record of communication that we have between the two philosophers is a postcard that Husserl sent Heidegger in the spring of 1916:

> Dear colleague,
>
> I would very much like to take advantage of your kind offer to let me see your *Habilitationsschrift*. Would you be good enough to send it on to me?
>
> Yours truly,
> E Husserl
> May 27, 1916[19]

Heidegger did give Husserl a published copy of his *Duns Scotus' Doctrine of Categories and Meaning* inscribed "For Professor E. Husserl, with most grateful respect,"[20] and apparently Husserl perused it and passed on a few comments. Two months later, however, Husserl did not seem to be clear on its contents, or to have much to say about it, or even to be very encouraging about it. He wrote to Heidegger on July 21, 1916:

> Dear colleague,
>
> Perhaps you would have time to visit me on Sunday morning [July 23] (sometime before visiting hours, 10:00). I really have not had any possibility to go through your work again, and my ideas have perhaps faded a bit; I doubt I would have anything further to say that might be useful. I have had too many different things to do. Still, I would be pleased if you could come.
>
> With cordial greetings,
> Yours,
> E Husserl[21]

---

[19] *Briefwechsel*, IV, p. 127. Most of Heidegger's letters to Husserl were destroyed in an Allied bombing during World War II. The only letters preserved are printed in *Briefwechsel*: April 14, 1922 (IV, pp. 136–7), October 22, 1927 (IV, pp. 144–148; translated in this volume, below), and the letter of April 29, 1933 (IV, pp. 160–1) from Elfriede Heidegger.

[20] "Herrn Professor E. Husserl in dankbarster Verehrung überreicht vom Verfasser": Husserl's copy of the work is in the Hussserl-Archives, Leuven, catalogue no. BP 75.

[21] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 127. A few months later Heidegger presented Husserl with an inscribed copy of his trial lecture for the *Habilitation* (delivered a year earlier, July 27, 1915), "Der Zeitbegriff in der Geschichtswissenschaft," which had just been published in *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, 161 (1916), 173–188. Husserl responded: "Esteemed Doctor, Thank you very much for kindly sending me your qualifying lecture. Your gift has pleased me very much. With best wishes, Yours, E Husserl, 28.9.16." *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 127.

Husserl nonetheless helped Heidegger get the work published that year, presumably by intervening with the Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft in Freiburg in order to get Heidegger a publication grant.[22] Husserl also helped to arrange for the young Privatdozent to teach a course during the winter semester of 1916, "Basic Questions of Logic," in Seminar II (the Catholic program) of the Philosophy Department.[23] Moreover, at least twice Husserl expressed his willingness to help Heidegger in his studies. On December 10, 1916 he wrote: "If I am able to assist you in your studies, and if you so wish, I will not let you down in the matter."[24] Likewise, as the autumn semester of 1917 was about to begin, Husserl (who was still away on vacation) wrote to Heidegger:

Bernau
September 24, 1917

Esteemed colleague,

I shall return to Freiburg from my stay in Bernau only on September 30 or October 1. I am sorry that I cannot be of help to you before that. We can agree on the details when I return, but I will happily help you with your studies as much as I am able. On October 4 I begin my lecture course on logic, an effort to bring my work on the problem of time to some kind of conclusion.

With cordial greetings to you and your wife,
Yours truly,
E Husserl[25]

However, just two weeks after this second offer of help, on October 8, 1917, Husserl wrote a letter about Heidegger that described the young scholar with faint praise at best and thereby may have cost him a full-time university position.[26] In response to a query from Professor Paul Natorp of Marburg University concerning Heidegger's eligibility for a professorship at Marburg, Husserl wrote that "up to this time I have not had sufficient opportunity to get to know him closely and to form a reliable judgment for myself about his personality and character. In any case I have nothing bad to say about him." While Husserl was pleased to tell Natorp that Heidegger has distanced himself

---

[22] See Heidegger's remark at the end of his Preface to the work, *Frühe Schriften*, p. 191.

[23] See Karl Schuhmann, *Husserl-Chronik: Denk- und Lebensweg Edmund Husserls*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977, p. 203, re: October 10, 1916; also Bernhard Casper, "Martin Heidegger und die Theologische Fakultät Freiburg 1909–1923," in Remigius Bäumer, Karl Suso Frank, and Hugo Ott, eds., *Kirche am Oberrhein. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bistümer Konstanz und Freiburg*, Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1980, pp. 534–541, here p. 539. Also Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, p. 461 and p. 553, n. 5. On the Catholic program in philosophy see Sheehan, "Heidegger's *Lehrjahre*," p. 96 and p. 131, n. 91.

[24] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 128.

[25] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 128.

[26] *Briefwechsel* V, pp. 131–2.

from Rickert's work, he nevertheless wrote that he found Heidegger too young and not mature enough for the job. And remarking on Heidegger's qualifying dissertation on Duns Scotus, Husserl judged the work to be merely a beginner's effort (*Erstlingsbuch*).

One of the major obstacles to a better rapport between Husserl and Heidegger at this time was Husserl's fear that Heidegger was a Catholic-Thomistic philosopher of a dogmatic stripe. This was at a time when the Vatican, in its efforts to eradicate what it called "modernism" in the church, was demanding that Catholic intellectuals adhere to conservative interpretations of traditional philosophy and theology.[27] Husserl, who called himself a "free Christian" and a "non-dogmatic Protestant"[28] and who once denounced what he termed "the Catholic International,"[29] vigorously opposed ecclesiastical interference with philosophical research. "Scientific work would be deprived of its freedom," he once said with explicit reference to the Vatican, "if one had to fear being censured by some learned commission."[30]

It seems Husserl read his fears of confessional dogmatism into Privatdozent Heidegger. From November of 1914 through June of 1916 Heidegger had been an active candidate for the chair in Catholic philosophy (Seminar II) at Freiburg University. Husserl was present at the faculty meeting of June 23, 1916 when professor of history Heinrich Finke, a staunch and very conservative Catholic layman, recommended Heidegger as a fitting candidate for the chair precisely because Heidegger was a practicing Catholic. More than a year later, in the aforementioned letter to Natorp (October 8, 1917) Husserl would recall:

> It is certain that [Heidegger] is confessionally bound [to Catholicism], because he stands, so to speak, under the protection of our colleague Finke, our "Catholic historian." Accordingly last year [June 23, 1916] in committee meetings to fill the chair in Catholic philosophy here in our Philosophy Department – a chair that we would like to make a professional position in the history of medieval philosophy – [Heidegger] was also brought up for consideration, at which point Finke discussed him as an appropriate candidate in terms of his religious affiliation.[31]

---

[27] See Sheehan, "Heidegger's *Lehrjahre*," pp. 92–94 and p. 110.

[28] *Briefwechsel* VII, pp. 205–8 (Husserl to Rudolf Otto), here p. 207; E.T. in Sheehan, ed., *Heidegger, the Man and the Thinker*, pp. 23–5, here p. 24.

[29] Cited in Hugo Ott, *Martin Heidegger: Unterwegs zu seiner Biographie*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1988, p. 113; E.T. by Allan Blunden, *Martin Heidegger: A Political Life*, New York: Basic Books and London: Harper Collins, 1993, p. 115. Husserl's denunciation was made during a meeting of the philosophy faculty in late January (probably January 24), 1924; the report stems from the diary of Prof. Josef Sauer. See also *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 137 (Mrs. Malvine Husserl to Mrs. Elfriede Heidegger, February 19, 1924).

[30] Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, p. 110, E.T. p. 110.

[31] *Briefwechsel* V, p. 131. In the letter Husserl also mentions that a few months earlier (March 20, 1917) Heidegger had married a Protestant woman (Elfriede Petri), who, he says, "as far as I know, has not converted [to Catholicism] up to this point."

It would appear that Husserl's concerns about Catholic dogmatism in Heidegger were unfounded, although Husserl would not discover that until November, 1917, a month after writing this letter to Natorp. Through his student Heinrich Ochsner, who was a close friend of Heidegger's, Husserl learned that Heidegger had broken with such dogmatism at least three years before (by July, 1914, if not earlier[32]) and that between June 1916 and March 1917 Heidegger had undergone a crisis of faith that culminated in his virtual conversion to Protestantism and his abandonment of dogmatic Catholicism.[33] Only three years later did Husserl finally correct himself with Natorp and inform him that by 1917 the young Dr. Heidegger had "freed himself from dogmatic Catholicism" and had "cut himself off – clearly, energetically, and yet tactfully – from the sure and easy career of a 'philosopher of the Catholic worldview.'"[34] Husserl even took some credit for Heidegger's religious transformation. On March 5, 1919 he wrote to Rudolf Otto:

> Not without strong inner struggles did the two of them [Heidegger and Ochsner] gradually open themselves to my suggestions and also draw closer to me personally. In that same period they both underwent radical changes in their fundamental religious convictions.

Husserl goes on to marvel that

> my philosophical effect does have something revolutionary about it: Protestants become Catholic, Catholics become Protestant.... In arch-Catholic Freiburg I do not want to stand out as a corrupter of the youth, as a proselytizer, as an enemy of the Catholic Church. That I am not. I have not exercised the least influence on Heidegger's and Oxner's [sic] migration over to the ground of Protestantism, even though it can only be very pleasing to me as a 'non-dogmatic Protestant' and a free Christian...."[35]

It was at this point that Husserl began to open up to Heidegger both personally and professionally. After only a short while, however, their few direct personal contacts were broken off. On January 17, 1918 Heidegger was called

---

[32] See Heidegger's letter to Father Engelbert Krebs, July 19, 1914, in Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, p. 83; E.T. p. 81 and in Sheehan, "Heidegger's *Lehrjahre*," p. 113.

[33] On December 23, 1918 Mrs. Heidegger told Father Engelbert Krebs: "My husband has lost his church faith.... At the time of our marriage [March 20, 1917], his faith was already undermined by doubts." Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, p. 108; E.T. p. 109. See also, Thomas Sheehan, "Reading a Life: Heidegger and Hard Times," in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, ed. Charles Guignon, Cambridge, U.K., and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 70. Elfriede Heidegger's influence on her husband's turn from Catholicism is mentioned in Gerda Walther, *Zum anderen Ufer: Vom Marxismus und Atheismus zum Christentum*, Remagen: Der Leuchter/Otto Reichl Verlag, 1960, p. 207.

[34] *Briefwechsel* V, p. 139 (February 11, 1920, Husserl to Natorp).

[35] *Briefwechsel* VII, pp. 205–208; for the following passages, p. 205 and 207; in Sheehan, *Heidegger, the Man and the Thinker*, p. 23 and p. 24f.

up for active duty in the war, and at the end of August 1918, he was sent off to the Western Front.

The Bond is Forged: 1918

Heidegger was absent from Freiburg on military duty from January 17, 1918 through late November of that same year. It was during this period that the relation between him and Husserl blossomed – by mail. The Husserl-Archives possess four letters that Husserl wrote to Heidegger during 1918, always in response to letters or cards from Heidegger. The first three are addressed to Heidegger at his army camp at Heuberg in east Baden, where Heidegger was training with the 4th Company of the 113th Ersatz-Bataillon. They are brief but cordial, and full of promise of future collaboration. In a letter posted two weeks after Heidegger's departure from Freiburg, Husserl writes:

January 30, 1918

Dear colleague,

I am sincerely sorry that your postcard arrived too late. On Friday morning [February 1] we leave for Bernau (Rössle) for at least two months, and you can imagine what that has meant, and still means, in terms of packing.[36] I am taking along an enormous quantity of manuscripts and books, and I hope to be able to do a lot of work in the mountains. I am fervently hoping for a period of quiet contemplation to work out conclusively all the initiatives whose maturation has been interrupted time and again here in Freiburg. I regret very much that we can no longer get together and enjoy our συμφιλοσοφεῖν. I wish you again everything good and the very best for your military service.

With greetings to you and your wife,

Yours,

E Husserl

[P.S.] Cordial greetings to Dr. and Mrs. Rees.[37]

---

[36] It seems Heidegger had written to say he would visit Freiburg on leave in the coming days or weeks. From February 1 to April 27, 1918, Husserl vacationed in Bernau, near St. Blasien, some 15 miles southeast of Freiburg.

[37] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 129. The word συμφιλοσοφεῖν ["philosophizing together"] is an allusion to the passage in Aristotle's remark on friendship in *Nicomachean Ethics*, IX, 12, 1172 a 4–7: ἄλλοι δὲ...συμφιλοσοφοῦσιν, ἕκαστοι ἐν τούτῳ συνημερεύοντες ὅ τί περ μάλιστα ἀγαπῶσι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ.... ("[Whereas some friends drink together or play dice together], others [work out at the gymnasium together or hunt together or]... philosophize together, each of these groups passing the day together doing what they most love of all the things in life..."). The editors of *Briefwechsel* identify the personages named in the postscript as Dr. Theophil Rees (born in 1889), a doctor of internal medicine practicing in Constanz, and his wife Martha (deceased in 1919). See below, Husserl's letter of September 10, 1918.

Two months later Husserl answered another letter from Heidegger:

Bernau (Baden) (until around April 25)
March 28, 1918

Dear colleague,

I was immensely pleased to receive your greetings from the training camp. So now I don't have to worry about how your health is bearing up under the strains of military service. The refreshing disposition that speaks through the lines of your cordial letter is the best testimony that you are healthy and happy. The fact that you now have to put philosophy entirely aside for a while is very good. Hopefully, after the glorious victories in the West[38] the war will not drag on too much longer, and afterwards you can return with even greater vigor to the difficult problems you raise, and I will gladly do my part to bring you *in medias res* and to familiarize you with those *res* in συμφιλοσοφεῖν.[39] I firmly hope that this period in the army will redound to your benefit. It would be a pleasure for me if from time to time you again shared your news. Up here in this quiet valley a large project is coming to fruition for me: time and individuation, a renewal of a rational metaphysics based on principles.

With cordial greetings from my wife and me,
Yours,
E Husserl[40]

Heidegger wrote Husserl again in April, and Husserl responded some weeks later, after returning from vacation in Bernau:

Freiburg, May 11, 1918

Dear colleague,

Your splendid letter was a real joy for me, and if I did not answer it from Bernau, the reason was that I had to make use of each and every hour, immersed as I was in some very productive work. Productivity is an energy hard to come by: how long it takes, and what great efforts of preparatory work, to get the *corporea moles* moving and the mental fires burning. Here in Freiburg, right from

---

[38] On March 21, a week before Husserl wrote this letter, General Erich Ludendorff had begun a series of immense (and, as it turned out, ultimately unsuccessful) offensives against the Allied forces in northeast France near Amiens. In February of that year Hindenburg had told a secret session of the Reichstag that the attacks had to take place before United States troops entered the battlefield in full strength. He predicted the attacks would result in 1.5 million German deaths but would lead to victory in four months. Heidegger was sent to the front in late August, long after the main force of these German attacks was spent.

[39] The Latin phrase is from Horace, Epistolarum Liber Secundus, III ("Ars Poetica") *Complete Works*, two volumes in one, ed. Charles E. Bennett, revised by John C. Rolfe, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1958, vol. 2, *Satires and Epistles*, revised edition by John C. Rolfe, p. 115: "semper ad eventum festinat et in medias res / non secus ac notas auditorem rapit...". (The successful epic poet "always hastens into the action and sweeps the listener into the midst of things that are not otherwise familiar....") In using the phrase Husserl might be indicating that Heidegger is still a novice, not entirely familiar with phenomenology.

[40] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 129–30.

the start I had more to do than I expected. I found that my "Introduction to Philosophy" was not clear enough as regards developing (by way of the history of ideas) the ideal of strict science beginning from Plato's methodological conceptions, and so I have to work out a new lecture course.[41] (It is also a question of the original motivating force of the critique of reason as regards Gorgias' second argument and then as regards Descartes' field of pure *cogitatio* – in contrast to the development among the ancients, which runs along logical-epistemological and ontological lines, which nonetheless bore lasting fruit for modern times in the exact sciences.) In the meantime your recent cordial and delightful postcard arrived. If I had only known that you were still here when I got back on April 26, I would have invited you over right away![42] During this Pentecost week I was thinking of going back up to Bernau with the children (if they have vacation). The muggy spring weeks weigh me down and stifle me in these lower altitudes, and perhaps I might relax a bit after this overlong period of work. I am glad that, as I hoped, you are managing to get through basic training so well. You are like a house plant that had grown languid in the stale air of a closed room but that thrives when placed outside in the open air and in the light of the open sky. It is good that you are also able to read a little, and you have made a fine choice. For you this is not the time for abstract speculations. Go a bit easier on yourself and keep in good spirits. Let your health and strength increase. That which grows freely from within and stretches towards the heights will reach its *telos* of itself.

With cordial greetings,
Yours,
E Husserl[43]

In early July Heidegger was transferred from Heuberg to Charlottenburg, outside Berlin, for training as a military weatherman at the Kommando der Heimatwetterwarte (Meteorology Headquarters, Homefront). He wrote to Husserl from Charlottenburg on July 21, but Husserl did not answer. At the end of August Heidegger, along with his unit, Frontwetterwarte 414 (Warfront Meteorology Corps 414), was transferred to France, a few kilometers northwest of Verdun. From there he wrote Husserl yet again, and this time Husserl wrote back. These were difficult days for Husserl: the collapse of the German armies on the Western Front, which began in early August, had left him quite depressed. He opened his letter to Heidegger with an extraordinary passage that expresses his personal feelings towards the young scholar-soldier.[44]

---

[41] Two years earlier Husserl had given a summer semester course, "Einleitung in die Philosophie," on the possibility of philosophy as an exact systematic science. He reworked it in part for the summer semester (May to July) of 1918.

[42] Husserl mistakenly writes "May 26" [26. V.], which still lay fifteen days in the future. Judging from a letter to Roman Ingarden, Husserl actually returned from Bernau to Freiburg on April 27: *Briefwechsel* III, p. 183 (April 27, 1918: "Ich bin eben in der Heimfahrt....").

[43] *Briefwechsel*, IV, p. 131.

[44] This is the longest letter we have from Husserl to Heidegger: *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 131–136.

Bernau, September 10, 1918

Dear colleague,

Today I am taking a bit of a holiday. This is the sixth week that I have been here, and what with working nine to ten hours a day, with only one full day off so far, the threat of going thick and numb in the head has finally set in. What better way to enter into the energy of a revitalizing and refreshing life than to write to you! O how your youth is a joy to me, how truly heartening it is that you allow me to share in it through your letters. And yours is a true and authentic youth that can still well up and throw itself at the world, full of feeling and with clear vision, and absorb a true image of that world deep into your soul – and then speak itself forth in honest language and forge its own particular way of expressing the image it has formed. In that, you are "learned" as only someone *primus in prima*, and yet with all that, you still have eyes and heart and words. [...] It is impossible to imagine you ever betraying that for some silly gains or frittering it away – the treasure of such a pure and unspoiled youth, your soul's clear vision, that pure heart, that clear sense of purpose with its solid *diathesis* [disposition] for pure and noble goals – to lose all that in the drive to become some pompous, self-important "famous philosopher" – no, it's unthinkable. In fact, there is not a chance of that so long as you can still write letters full of such freedom and serenity of spirit.

The letter goes on to discuss Husserl's recent work and to range widely through a report of what Husserl had been reading: Rudolf Otto's *Das Heilige,* a book that Heidegger in fact may have recommended to him[45] and which Husserl regrets Heidegger does not have time to review; an essay by Eduard Spranger; Johannes Volkelt's *Gewissheit und Wahrheit* (1918), and especially Paul Natorp's *Allgemeine Psychologie nach kritischer Methode* (1912), of which he is particularly critical ("[it] shows that Natorp was incapable of grasping the clear and obvious sense of phenomenology as an eidetic analysis of pure consciousness, prior to and independent of already existing philosophy and science, and that in general he could not valorize seeing and what is given to seeing."[46]). Finally Husserl concludes:

I have to close now, joining the very cordial greetings of my wife and of Dr. and Mrs. Rees (who, to our great joy, have been here – for three weeks) to our own good wishes and friendship. I need not tell you how heavily the recent events of the war weigh upon our spirits.[47] Yet it will certainly turn out for the

[45] *Briefwechsel* VII, p. 206 (Husserl to Rudolf Otto, March 5, 1919); E.T., *Heidegger, the Man and the Thinker*, p. 24.

[46] Heidegger would attack this work of Natorp's during his first lecture course after the war, in February and March of 1919: Martin Heidegger, *Die Idee der Philosophie und das Weltanschauungsproblem* in *Zur Bestimmung der Philosophie*, ed. Bernd Heimbüchel, *Gesamtausgabe* II, 56/57, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1987, pp. 77 ff.

[47] The collapse of the Western front began on August 8, 1918 and continued unabated for three months until the armistice and the surrender of the Second Reich on November 11. For Husserl's reactions, see his

good, and if we mean to hold our ground against it all – and we do, and of course we will – it will happen in the correct form of re-action, whereby we will declare our faith in the good in the only way we can – *actively*: by standing our ground and putting our small powers (which, in the overall reckoning, also count) at the service of that good. Each must do his part as if the salvation of the world depended on it: I in phenomenology, you as a weatherman and [soon enough] as a phenomenologist of religion in the office next door. [48]

NB. I too have next to me my Hölderlin, whom I love very much and yet know too little, and so you and I will be in touch, reading him.[49]

Best wishes to you.

Yours,

E Husserl[50]

"Philosophical Soulmates": The First Freiburg Period: 1919–1923[51]

The war over, Heidegger returned to Freiburg by early December of 1918,[52] and the new relationship between the two philosophers, the Master and his new protégé, quickly took off. On January 21, 1919 Husserl made Heidegger his new assistant, filling the position that Edith Stein had left eleven months before. This was a salaried job that Heidegger would keep, along with his teaching position as a Privatdozent, through the summer of 1923.

On February 7, 1919 Heidegger began his first course after the war, "The Idea of Philosophy and the Problem of World-view."[53] Already here at the

---

later letters to Gustav Albrecht, *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 56 (April 12, 1919): "The events since August [of 1918], followed by the frightful collapse [of imperial Germany], threaten to consume me from within. I have suffered unspeakably, and at times was as if paralyzed." And to Fritz Kaufmann, *Briefwechsel* III, p. 343 (January 17, 1919): "You can imagine how much I, like everyone with patriotic sentiments, suffered and still suffer at the frightful collapse of our great and noble nation. I sought to save myself by plunging deeply into philosophical work – just as I waged the struggle for spiritual self-preservation throughout the war years."

[48] Heidegger the weatherman had the job of helping plan poison gas attacks on American soldiers who were advancing northeast towards Sedan: Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, pp. 104f. and 151; E.T. pp. 105 and 154. For anecdotal accounts of the effects of these gas attacks, see Elaine George Collins, ed., *If Not for War*, Redwood City, Calif.: D. G. Collins, 1989, pp. 86f. and 123f.

[49] Years later Heidegger remarked: "During the campaign [of the Great War] Hölderlin's hymns were stuffed into one's backpack right along with the cleaning gear." "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes," *Gesamtausgabe* I/5, p. 3; E.T. in *Basic Writings*, revised and expanded edition, ed. David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: Harper SanFrancisco, 1993, p. 145.

[50] *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 135–6.

[51] I derive the phrase "philosophical soulmates" from Husserl's ironic remark in *Briefwechsel* III, p. 493 (Husserl to Dietrich Mahnke, May 4/5, 1933): "Der schönste Abschluß dieser vermeintlichen philosophischen Seelenfreundschaft...."

[52] Information from the late Mrs. Elfriede Heidegger, August 1977.

[53] "Die Idee der Philosophie und das Weltanschauungsproblem," in *Zur Bestimmung der Philosophie*, *Gesamtausgabe* II, 56/57, pp. 3–117. The numbers within parentheses in this and the following paragraphs, unless otherwise indicated, refer to this text. Heidegger delivered this course during the "war emergency semester" (*Kriegsnotsemester*) which ran from January 25 through April 16, 1919. Heidegger's course began

very beginning, the radical differences between Husserl and Heidegger were in evidence. No sooner had Heidegger started his new course, presumably teaching as a phenomenologist in the tradition of Husserl, than he started attacking the Master for attributing primacy to theory over lived experience, and specifically for privileging the pure transcendental ego over what Heidegger at this point called the "historical ego" and the "ego of the situation."[54] "We find ourselves at a methodological crossroads," he told his students on March 14, 1919, "where it will be decided whether philosophy shall live or die" (p. 63). For Heidegger everything depends on first getting clear about what philosophy's true issue is. "What is distorting the real problematic is not just naturalism, as some people think," he said with explicit reference to Husserl, "but the overall dominance and primacy of the *theoretical*" (p. 87).[55]

For Heidegger the theoretical orientation of the pure ego of Husserlian phenomenology sucks the blood out of the richly textured *Umwelt*, that "first-hand world" of lived experience in which one primarily exists and carries out practical tasks. In this first-hand world, things are not just "there," and they do not primarily have "value." They are not even just "things." They are "*the significant* – that's what is primary.... When you live in a first-hand world [*Umwelt*], everything comes at you loaded with meaning, all over the place and all the time, everything is enworlded, '*world happens*'..." (p. 73). In this way of living, we do not know ourselves as egos who observe the entities lying around us. Rather (this was Heidegger's rereading of intentionality), we are the act of experientially "*living out unto something*" [*ein "Leben auf etwas zu"*], which has "absolutely nothing to do with an ego." (p. 68f.) This primary level of experience is intensely personal: "Only in the resonances of one's own individual 'I' does a first-hand thing [*ein Umweltliches*] get experienced, only there does 'world happen,' and wherever and whenever world does happen for me, *I* am somehow entirely there" (p. 73).

Heidegger argues that this richly textured first-hand world gets drained of all life, meaning, and history when it becomes infected by theory.[56] The dynamic, personal and historical "happening" (*Er-eignis*) of world, which is intimately bound up with the living and appropriating of one's own life, gets flattened out to a "process" (*Vor-gang*) of objective knowledge. Ultimately the human being is reduced to a level of experience that is "absolutely without world, world-alien, a sphere where the breath is knocked out of you, and you

---

on February 7. For the following, see Sheehan, "Reading a Life," in *Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, pp. 77–79.

[54] *Gesamtausgabe*, II, 56/57, p. 205f.

[55] Heidegger was referring to Husserl's "Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft," *Logos* I (1910–11), 289–341; E.T. by Quentin Lauer, "Philosophy as Rigorous Science," in Edmund Husserl, *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*, ed. Quentin Lauer, New York: Harper & Row, 1965, pp. 71–147.

[56] *Gesamtausgabe* II, 56/57, p. 89: *ent-lebt, ent-deutet, ent-geschichtlicht, Infizierung*.

cannot live."[57] "In theoretical acts I leave my lived experience behind. To be sure, something that is still experienceable comes along with me – but no one knows what to do with it, so they invent the convenient label of the 'irrational' for it." (p. 117)

To preserve the first-hand world of lived experience (including the world of religious experience[58]) from the ravages of theorizing, Heidegger in this course radically reinterprets the "principle of all principles" that Husserl had laid down for phenomenology in section 24 of his *Ideas I* (1913). If, according to Husserl, first-hand intuition is the starting point of phenomenology, such an intuition ("even though Husserl doesn't say this in so many words," Heidegger notes) is not some theoretical comportment but an "understanding intuition, a *hermeneutical intuition*," from which theory is but a precipitate (p. 117). This hermeneutical intuition, which already understands the world prior to any theorizing and which is the basis of all the rigor that phenomenology claims for itself, is

> the aboriginal intention of authentic living, the aboriginal comportment of lived experience and of life as such, the absolute *sympathy with life*, which is identical with lived experience. Prior to anything else – that is, if we take this path away from theory and more and more free ourselves from it – we *see* this basic comportment all the time, we have an orientation *to* it. This basic comportment is absolute, but only if we live in it directly. And no conceptual system, no matter how elaborately constructed, can reach it. Only phenomenological living, as it continually intensifies itself, can get to it. (p. 110)

This *Urhabitus*, or basic way-of-being that Heidegger calls phenomenological living, "cannot be acquired from one day to the next, like putting on a uniform." It is not a method and has nothing to do with adopting "standpoints" (that, he says, would be the "mortal sin" that ruins everything). Rather, phenomenology, like lived experience, "can authenticate and prove itself only through itself," that is, only in the *living* of it (p. 110).

All of this, which came in the first two months of Heidegger's post-war teaching, did not promise faithful adherence to traditional Husserlian phenomenology. And there is evidence that, at least initially, Heidegger did not conceal his philosophical differences from Husserl but was open and frank with him about these matters. For example, on June 21, 1919, just two months after the aforementioned course had finished, Heidegger apparently declared in Husserl's presence that the pure ego of Husserlian phenomenology was (in the words of a participant in the discussion) merely "derived from the 'historical ego' by way of repressing all historicity and quality" and thus "the

---

[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 78, 112; cf. p. 205.
[58] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 207 and 211.

subject only of acts directed to theoretical objects."[59] Five years later (June 12, 1925) Heidegger told his students in the classroom at Marburg: "Let me say that Husserl is aware of my objections from my lecture courses in Freiburg as well as here in Marburg and from personal conversations, and is essentially making allowances for them...."[60] But it was this same Heidegger who, only two years earlier (February 20, 1923), had written to Karl Löwith to describe the last hours of his seminar of winter semester 1922–23:

> In the final hours of the seminar, I publicly burned and destroyed the *Ideas* to such an extent that I dare say that the essential foundations for the whole [of my work] are now cleanly laid out. Looking back from this vantage point to the *Logical Investigations*, I am now convinced that Husserl was never a philosopher, not even for one second in his life. He becomes ever more ludicrous.[61]

Likewise on May 8, 1923, Heidegger again wrote to Löwith, this time to say that Heidegger's lecture course that semester, *Ontologie: Hermeneutik der Faktizität*

> strikes the main blows against phenomenology. I now stand completely on my own feet. ...There is no chance of getting an appointment [with Husserl's help]. And after I have published, my prospects will be finished. The old man will then realize that I am wringing his neck – and then the question of succeeding him is out. But I can't help myself.[62]

And a few months later, writing to Jaspers, Heidegger said:

> Husserl has come entirely unglued – if, that is, he ever was "glued," which more and more I have begun to doubt of late. He goes from pillar to post, uttering trivialties that would make you weep. He lives off his mission as the "Founder of Phenomenology," but nobody knows what that means.[63]

---

[59] Ms. Gerda Walther's letter to Alexander Pfänder, written on Friday, June 20, 1919, describes a philosophical attack on the pure ego that Heidegger and others were *planning* for the following morning, when Husserl would hold his accustomed Saturday discussions with his students. The attack, she says, is to be spearheaded by Julius Ebbinghaus and to be followed up by Heidegger in the manner indicated above. (See R III Pfänder, 20.VI.19, Husserl-Archives, Leuven). See also her *Zum anderen Ufer: Vom Marxismus und Atheismus zum Christentum*, Remagen: Der Leuchter-Otto Reichl Verlag, 1960, p. 213f.

[60] Martin Heidegger, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, *Gesamtausgabe*, Bd. 20, ed. Petra Jaeger, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1979, p. 167; E.T.: *History of the Concept of Time*, trans. Theodore Kisiel, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1985, p. 121.

[61] The translation here is by Theodore Kisiel, to whom I am grateful for this and the next text, which do *not* appear in "Drei Briefe Martin Heideggers an Karl Löwith," ed. Hartmut Tietjen, in *Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers*, ed. Dietrich Papenfuss and Otto Pöggeler, 3 vols., Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1990, 1991, here II (1990), pp. 27–39. The seminar in question was "Phenomenological Exercises for Beginners in Connection with Husserl, *Ideas I*."

[62] See the previous footnote.

[63] Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel* (July 14, 1923), p. 42.

II. THE PARTING OF THE WAYS[64]

The question of the differences between Husserl and Heidegger that emerge in Heidegger's lecture courses between 1919 and 1928 lies beyond the scope of the present work. It has been exhaustively treated in Theodore Kisiel's *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, and in shorter form in his article "Husserl and Heidegger."[65] With only passing reference to some of the criticisms, we now turn to the other end of the relation between Husserl and Heidegger, the parting of the ways.[66]

The EB Article and the Amsterdam Lectures were composed at a time (1927–28) when Husserl and Heidegger's relationship was falling apart over philosophical differences. It had long been public knowledge that Heidegger's approach to phenomenology was quite different from Husserl's and perhaps even opposed to it. But in 1927–28 the personal and philosophical relation between the two men came under great strain and finally ruptured. While we cannot engage all the details, we may note at least the following events.

---

[64] I draw the title from James C. Morrison's "Husserl and Heidegger: The Parting of the Ways," in Frederick Elliston, ed., *Heidegger's Existential Analytic*, The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1978, pp. 47–60.

[65] Theodore Kisiel, "Husserl and Heidegger" in *Encyclopaedia of Phenomenology*, ed. Lester Embree. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997, pp. 333–339.

[66] A list of examples of criticisms of Husserl that Heidegger made during his lecture courses would include the following. **(1)** *Summer semester, 1920*, "Phenomenology of Intuition and Expression: Theory of Philosophical Concept-Formation": July 19 (critique of Husserl's notion of intuitive presentation and the idea of constitution); July 22 (general critique of the primacy of the theoretical); July 26 (critique of the ideas of philosophy as science and of a priori grammar). **(2)** *Summer semester, 1923*, "Ontology: Hermeneutics of Facticity": July 4 (critique of the model of mathematical rigor and of the epistemological emphasis and lack of history in phenomenology); cf. Martin Heidegger, *Ontologie (Hermeneutik der Faktizität), Gesamtausgabe* II/63, ed. Käte Bröcker-Oltmanns, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1988, pp. 71 and 75. **(3)** *Winter semester, 1923–24*, "Introduction to Phenomenological Research": November 19 and 20 (attack on Husserl's notion of certitude, evidence, and absolute knowledge); December 4 (critique of the primacy of theoretical interests); February 15–26 (generalized critique of Husserl via critique of Descartes on, e.g., mathematical method). **(4)** *Summer semester, 1925*, "History of the Concept of Time": June 9–16 (critique of Husserl's notion of consciousness and his neglect of the question of being); Martin Heidegger, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, pp. 140–182; E.T. *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*, pp. 102–131. **(5)** *Winter semester, 1925–26*, "Logic (Aristotle)": November 24–30 (passim: critique of Husserl's notion of truth): cf. Martin Heidegger, *Logik: Die Frage nach der Wahrheit, Gesamtausgabe* II/21, ed. Walter Biemel, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976, pp. 89–125. **(6)** *Summer semester, 1927*, "Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie": May 4 (differences between Husserl's and Heidegger's notion of phenomenological reduction); May 11 (critique of Husserl's notion of intentionality); May 28 (critique of Husserl's notion of being as consciousness); June 22 (critique of Husserl's inadequate treatment of logic): cf. Martin Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie, Gesamtausgabe*, II/24, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975, pp. 81 (cf. 89–90), 175–6, and 253; E.T., *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, trans. Albert Hofstadter, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1982, pp. 54 (cf. p. 64), 124–5, and 178. **(7)** *Summer semester, 1928*, "Logic (Leibniz)": July 2 (critique of Husserl on the being of consciousness, on intentionality, on *νόησις* as primarily cognitive); July 12 (critique of Husserl's notion of ontology): cf. Martin Heidegger, *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik, Gesamtausgabe* II/26, ed. Klaus Held, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1978, pp. 167 and 190; E.T. by Michael Heim, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1984, pp. 133 and 150.

Sein und Zeit, 1926–1927

The publication of *Sein und Zeit* began with a "publish-or-perish" situation, the history of which has been amply laid out elsewhere.[67] Here we limit ourselves to a few remarks concerning Husserl and Heidegger.

The writing of *Sein und Zeit*, 1926

Heidegger had been teaching at Marburg's Philipps University since the autumn of 1923. On July 8, 1925, thanks in good measure to Husserl's unwavering support,[68] Heidegger found himself to be the faculty's sole nominee to succeed Nicolai Hartmann in the chair of philosophy there. However, on January 27, 1926 the National Minister of Education, Carl Heinrich Becker, blocked the appointment on the grounds that Heidegger did not yet have enough publications. When the dean of the Philosophy Faculty, Max Deutschbein, advised him to get something published in a hurry, Heidegger informed him that, thanks to Husserl's intervention, the publisher Max Niemeyer was prepared to bring out the first half of *Sein und Zeit* in book form (some 240 printed pages) at the same time that Husserl published the work in his *Jahrbuch*.[69] The text allegedly existed, more or less, in manuscript, and on February 25, 1926 Heidegger promised Deutschbein that in one month – by April 1, 1926 – he would have the whole thing in the printer's hands. The next day Heidegger finished his lecture course "Logik: Aristoteles," and a few days later he was at his cabin in Todtnauberg, hard at work on fulfilling his promise.

The dedication of *Sein und Zeit*, April 1926

In early March, Husserl joined Heidegger in the Black Forest village of Todtnauberg, twelve miles southeast of Freiburg, for a vacation that would

---

[67] Cf. note 5 above.

[68] Writing to Professor Erich Rudolf Jaensch of Marburg, Husserl was effusive in his praise of Heidegger: "[I]n the new generation [Heidegger] is the only philosophical personality of such creative, resourceful originality." "In my eyes Heidegger is without a doubt the most significant of those on their way up" and is "predestined to be a philosopher of great style.... He has kept silent for years so as to be able to publish only what is completely mature and definitively compelling. His publications that are soon to come out will show just how much he has to say and how original it is." *Briefwechsel* III, p. 334 (June 26, 1925, to Jaensch). See Theodore Kisiel, "The Missing Link in the Early Heidegger," in *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: Lectures and Essays*, ed. Joseph J. Kockelmans, Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1988, pp. 1–40.

[69] Heidegger's (much later) account of the matter is found in his "Mein Weg in die Phänomenologie," *Zur Sache des Denkens*, pp. 81–90; here pp. 87–88; E.T., "My Way Into Phenomenology" in *On Time and Being*, pp. 74–82; here p. 80.

extend until April 29.[70] On April 1, true to his promise, Heidegger sent off to Niemeyer Publishers the manuscript of the first thirty-eight sections of *Sein und Zeit*. Exactly one week later, on Husserl's sixty-seventh birthday, Heidegger presented the Master with a bouquet of flowers and a handwritten page, inscribed:[71]

> Being and Time
> by
> M. Heidegger (Marburg a. L.)
> ...δῆλον γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς μὲν ταῦτα (τί ποτε βούλεσθε σημαίνειν ὁπόταν ὂν φθέγγησθε) πάλαι γιγνώσκετε, ἡμεῖς δὲ πρὸ τοῦ μὲν ᾠόμεθα, νῦν δ'ἠπορήκαμεν.
> "...for clearly you have long understood what you mean when you use the word 'being,' whereas we used to think we knew, but now we are at a loss."
> *Plato*, Sophist 244a
>
> **To Edmund Husserl**
> in grateful respect and friendship.
>
> Todtnauberg in the Black Forest, April 8, 1926.[72]

Husserl saved this paper and, a year later when the book was published, glued it into his own copy of *Sein und Zeit*.

---

[70] *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 66 (April 28, 1926, to Albrecht). The Husserls were lodged for the duration in the home of a Frau Ratzinger.

[71] See *Briefwechsel* III, p. 230 (April 16, 1926, Malvine Husserl to Ingarden): "Brilliant sunshine, cordial birthday letters from everywhere, and Heidegger (who has his own cabin up here, where he spends all his holidays with his family) brought a scroll, covered with flowers, on which was inscribed the dedication of the work he has just completed: 'To Edmund Husserl in grateful respect and friendship.' This book bears the title *Being and Time* and will be published as the leading article in the next volume [i.e, Volume VIII] of the *Jahrbuch*." In the 1960s Heidegger recalled that at this point the manuscript of *Sein und Zeit* was "almost finished [nahezu fertig]." See the editor's introduction to Edmund Husserl, *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins (1893–1917)*, Husserliana: *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. X, ed. Rudolf Boehm, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966, p.xiv.

[72] For further details on this dedication page, and the changes that would be made in it in the published version, see below, "The Marginal Remarks in *Being and Time*."

The Publication of *Sein und Zeit*, April 1927

Heidegger's effort to succeed Hartmann failed: In December of 1926 the Minister of Education, having seen the galleys of the forthcoming *Sein und Zeit*, found the work "inadequate" and refused to appoint Heidegger to the chair.[73] Nonetheless, a year later, in April of 1927,[74] *Sein und Zeit* appeared first as a separately printed book ("Sonderdruck") and shortly afterwards in Husserl's *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, vol. VIII.[75] From March 2 until April 19, 1927, Heidegger spent the academic holiday at his cabin at Todtnauberg.[76] During that vacation he visited Husserl in Freiburg sometime between April 6 and April 19 – possibly on Friday, April 8, which marked Husserl's sixty-eighth birthday and the one-year anniversary of the handwritten dedication.[77] Either during that visit or at some other time in April of 1927, Heidegger gave Husserl a bound copy of the Sonderdruck of *Sein und Zeit*, embellished with yet another handwritten inscription:

---

[73] See Husserl's letter to Heidegger concerning this, *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 139 (December 1926).

[74] *SZ* was not published "in February [of 1927]" as Heidegger reports in "Mein Weg in die Phänomenologie," p. 88, E.T. p. 81. But when it was published is a matter of some debate. (1) Bast and Delfosse note that the separately printed version ("Sonderdruck") appeared "shortly after" the *Jahrbuch* edition: "Wenig später erschien die *Separatausgabe*, der in den Aufl[age] sogenannte 'Sonderdruck,'" Rainer A. Bast and Heinrich P. Delfosse, *Handbuch zum Textstudium von Martin Heideggers 'Sein und Zeit'*, vol. 1: *Stellenindizes, philologisch-kritischer Apparat*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1979, p. 382. (2) However, Kisiel gives good evidence, based on *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 144 (May 8, 1927, to Heidegger) that the order of publication was reversed (*Genesis*, p. 487 taken with p. 565, n. 30). (3) Kisiel likewise dates the publication of *SZ* to "late April 1927" (*Genesis*, p. 489); however, the work may have appeared earlier than that. Husserl's "Sonderdruck" version, in which he made his marginal notes, is inscribed by Heidegger "Zum 8. April 1927," that is, Husserl's sixty-eighth birthday. Had the separate printing appeared by that date – hence, in early rather than late April? Did the separate printing appear after that date and did Heidegger backdate his inscription to Husserl's birthday?

[75] (1) *Sein und Zeit*, Erste Hälfte, Sonderdruck aus *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, Band VII [sic!], Halle a.d. Saale, Niemeyer 1927 (format: 23 × 17 cm.), pp. xii + 438; and (2) in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, vol. VIII, pages v–ix + 1–438, sharing that volume with Oskar Becker's *Mathematische Existenz: Untersuchungen zur Logik und Ontologie mathematischer Phänomene*, pages ix–xii + 439–809. The printer of both the "Sonderdruck" and the *Jahrbuch* was the same: Buchdruckerei des Waisenhauses, in Halle.

[76] Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel* p. 74 (March 1, 1927) and p. 76 (April 18, 1927); also Martin Heidegger and Elisabeth Blochmann, *Briefwechsel, 1918–1969*, ed. Joachim W. Storck, Marbach am Neckar: Deutsches Literaturarchiv, 1989, p. 19 (March 27, 1927). Hereinafter abbreviated as: Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*.

[77] On Tuesday, April 5, Husserl arrived back in Freiburg after spending a month with his son Gerhart in Kiel. He immediately wrote to Heidegger in Todtnauberg: "Dearest friend, I have *just* gotten home from the railroad station, and I hear of your inquiry [presumably to visit Husserl, perhaps on the 8th]. It goes without saying that you and your wife are cordially welcome. But I can't believe it is possible that you are already planning to go back to Marburg. You must visit with me a while and be my guest so that we can also have some time to talk philosophy [*wissenschaftlich*]. Naturally you can lodge with us." *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 140 (April 5, 1927, to Heidegger).

"For me the greatest clarity was always the greatest beauty"

Lessing

April 8, 1927.

M. Heidegger.

All of Heidegger's deference to the Master notwithstanding, Husserl had had his doubts about *Sein und Zeit* even before it was published. During the last weeks of his earlier Todtnauberg vacation (i.e., April 15–28, 1926), Husserl had helped Heidegger read through the first galley proofs that the printer had begun to provide. At the time Husserl said the work gave him "a great deal of satisfaction"[78] – even though some years later Husserl would say that his first impressions were of the work's "newfangled language and style of thinking" and its "exceptional, albeit unclarified, intellectual energy."[79] A month later, however, Heidegger was recording a much more critical reaction on the part of Husserl. Heidegger wrote to Karl Jaspers: "From the fact that Husserl finds the whole book to be quite odd and can 'no longer welcome it under the roof' of mainstream phenomenology, I conclude that *de facto* I'm already further along than I myself believe and see."[80]

Adumbrations of Conflict

Husserl's alienation from *Sein und Zeit* was arguably a reasonable reaction. In 1926 Husserl apparently did not know either how deeply Heidegger was opposed to Husserl's transcendental phenomenology or how long this had been the case (see Heidegger's remarks to Löwith in 1923, cited above). And of course he could not have known what Heidegger wrote to Jaspers at Christmas of 1926: "If the treatise has been written 'against' anyone, then it has been written against Husserl; he saw that right away, but from the start he has remained focused on the positive. What I write against – only with indirection, to be sure – is sham-philosophy...."[81] Nonetheless, Husserl was not entirely oblivious of Heidegger's opposition. For some years he had been hearing rumors that Heidegger was not just taking a different approach to

[78] Cf. *Briefwechsel* III, p. 347 (April 20, 1926, to Fritz Kaufmann).
[79] *Briefwechsel* II, p. 181 (January 6, 1931 to Pfänder), in Appendix II, below.
[80] Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, p. 64 (May 24, 1926).
[81] Heidegger/Jaspers *Briefwechsel*, p. 71 (December 26, 1926).

phenomenology but also working *against* Husserl. Years later Husserl confided bitterly to Alexander Pfänder,

> I had been warned often enough: Heidegger's phenomenology is something totally different from mine; rather than furthering the development of my scientific works, his university lectures as well as his book are, on the contrary, open or veiled attacks on my works, directed at discrediting them on the most essential points. When I used to relate such things to Heidegger in a friendly way, he would just laugh and say: Nonsense![82]

After *Sein und Zeit* was published Heidegger took steps to mitigate Husserl's fears, and there is some evidence that he may have succeeded for a while. As Husserl told Pfänder: "He himself steadily denied that he would abandon my transcendental phenomenology, and he referred me to his future second volume [of *Sein und Zeit*, which never appeared]. Given my low self-confidence at the time, I preferred to doubt myself, my capacity to follow and appreciate the unfamiliar themes of his thought, than to doubt him."[83]

But, Heidegger's denials aside, Husserl soon began to catch on. On August 3, 1927, while he was engaged on his first reading of the published volume, Husserl told Dietrich Mahnke, "On the face of it, [*Sein und Zeit*] distances itself entirely from my analytic phenomenology...."[84] Perhaps it was in order to test that impression that Husserl invited Heidegger first to criticize, and then to collaborate on, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article.

The Failed Collaboration on the EB Article, October 10–22, 1927

In September of 1927, with the deadline fast approaching, Husserl asked Heidegger to read and criticize the first draft of the article "Phenomenology" that the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, earlier in the year, had commissioned him to write. Heidegger read the draft while vacationing in Todtnauberg, and he gave his comments and suggestions to Husserl. After studying Heidegger's remarks, Husserl asked Heidegger to help him write a second draft of the article. The two men spent eleven days discussing and rewriting the EB Article at Husserl's home in Freiburg (October 10 to 20, 1927). For Heidegger, the problems with the Article lay in part with the fact that Husserl attributed the function of constitution to the transcendental ego, whereas Heidegger saw it

---

[82] *Briefwechsel* II, p. 182 (Jan. 6, 1931 to Pfänder), in Appendix below.

[83] *Briefwechsel* II, pp. 181–182 (January 6, 1931 to Pfänder); cf. III, 473 (January 8, 1931, to Mahnke): "...I long believed that I simply didn't completely understand him and that his new approaches were a continuation and improvement of my own!"

[84] *Briefwechsel* III, p. 456.

embedded in "factical Dasein." In a letter written to Husserl two days after the visit, Heidegger made a brief effort "to characterize the fundamental orientation of *Sein und Zeit* within the transcendental problem."[85] In the Introduction to the EB Article, I shall go into the details of that visit. At this point suffice it to say that this abortive effort at collaboration made it amply clear to Husserl that Heidegger was not about to follow in his philosophical footsteps. Those days mark the turning point in the relation of Husserl and Heidegger insofar as they let Husserl see for the first time just how far apart the two philosophers were.

The Discussion of *Sein und Zeit*, January 1928

Having completed the fourth and final draft of his EB Article by early December, 1927, Husserl devoted himself to finishing his reading of *Sein und Zeit*. The result was that his "focus on the positive," as Heidegger had put it to Jaspers (December 26, 1926), quickly faded. His letters to Roman Ingarden and Dietrich Mahnke towards the end of 1927 clearly exhibit a growing disappointment with Heidegger. To Ingarden, for example, he expressed his decided regrets:

> Heidegger has become a close friend of mine, and I am one of his admirers, as much as I must really regret that, regarding method and content, his work (and his lecture courses too, for that matter) seem to be essentially different from my works and courses; in any event, up to now there is still no bridge between him and me that the students we share in common can cross. As regards any further philosophy [between us], a lot depends on how and whether he works his way through to grasping my general intentions. Unfortunately I did not determine his philosophical upbringing; clearly he was already into his own way of doing things when he began studying my writings.[86]

By the end of 1927 Husserl was anxious to have a serious face-to-face discussion with Heidegger about *Sein und Zeit*. Anticipating a visit over the Christmas holidays when Heidegger would be vacationing in nearby Todtnauberg, Husserl wrote to him on December 14, 1927: "It would be a great help to me if you still could sketch out the abstract [of *Sein und Zeit*] that we discussed. In the interim [Oskar] Becker is helping out very enthusiastically with a *systematic* summary of how the work unfolds and a detailed explana-

---

[85] "...die grundsätzliche Tendenz von 'Sein und Zeit' innerhalb des transzendentalen Problems zu kennzeichnen": Heidegger's letter to Husserl, October 22, 1927, *Hu* IX, 600; E.T., in Part One, below.

[86] *Briefwechsel* III, p. 234 (November 19, 1927, to Ingarden); cf. also III, p. 236 (December 26, 1927, to Ingarden) and III, p. 457ff. (December 26, 1927, to Mahnke).

tion of its most important basic concepts and the basic doctrines they designate. Only now do I see how much I was lacking in understanding, for I had not yet gotten it right on the chapters dealing with temporality and historicity."[87]

Whether or not Heidegger brought Husserl the requested abstract on his way to Todtnauberg[88] (no such document has yet been found in Husserl's papers), five days after Christmas Mrs. Husserl followed up with a letter to Heidegger at his cabin: "My husband would like you to break your return trip [from Todtnauberg to Marburg] in such a way that you could give him a whole day for philosophical discussion of your book. He has devoted the entire [Christmas] vacation exclusively to studying the work, and he finds it indispensable to be instructed by you on a number of points that he cannot get entirely clear on."[89]

The meeting took place at Husserl's home on Sunday, January 8, 1928, as Heidegger was about to leave Todtnauberg for Marburg. We do not know what was said between the two philosophers. Certainly it is possible that Heidegger succeeded in explaining to Husserl the more obscure parts of *Sein und Zeit*. However, it is difficult to imagine that Heidegger persuaded Husserl that the criticisms he had been leveling against the phenomenology of absolute subjectivity were merely "formalistic," or convinced him that factical Dasein "harbors within itself the possibility of transcendental constitution."[90] All we have is one brief, almost telegraphic, report about the meeting. It stems from Heidegger, and seems a bit too optimistic. Apparently he did not realize how bad things had gotten between him and Husserl. On January 11, 1928, he wrote to Elisabeth Blochmann: "Last Sunday I walked down to Freiburg [from Todtnauberg] and had yet another beautiful, rich day with Husserl."[91]

---

[87] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 149 (December 14, 1927, to Heidegger).

[88] The Heidegger family apparently traveled through Freiburg to Todtnauberg during the week of December 18–24, 1927: Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 23 (December 10, 1927).

[89] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 150 (December 30, 1927, Malvine Husserl to Heidegger).

[90] The two phrases are from Heidegger's letter to Husserl, October 22, 1927, *Hu* IX, respectively p. 600 ("formalistisch") and p. 601 ("daß die Seinsart des menschlichen Daseins...gerade in sich die Möglichkeit der transzendentalen Konstitution birgt"; cf. p. 602: "daß die Existenzverfassung des Daseins die transzendentale Konstitution alles Positiven ermöglicht"); E.T., in Part One, below. It seems clear that the latter claim was sincerely held by Heidegger, and this lends at least *formal* veracity to the denial that Husserl recorded: "He [Heidegger] himself steadily denied that he would abandon my transcendental phenomenology, and he referred me to his future second volume [of *Sein und Zeit*]": *Briefwechsel* II, p. 182 (January 6, 1931, to Pfänder).

[91] Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 23 (January 11, 1928).

Heidegger's Editing of Husserl's Lectures on Internal Time-Consciousness, Spring–Summer 1928

Since at least April 8, 1926 Husserl had urged upon Heidegger the editing and publishing of Husserl's Göttingen lectures on the intentional character of time-consciousness. (In interviews and communications from the 1940s through the 1960s Heidegger took pains to deny rumors that he took the initiative and persuaded Husserl to let him edit the lectures for the purpose of revealing the contrast between Husserl's conception of time and his own.[92]) As Heidegger later recalled events, Husserl first made the proposal to him in Todtnauberg on the very day Heidegger dedicated *Sein und Zeit* to him; and Heidegger accepted, perhaps reluctantly, with the understanding that he could not take up the work until at least the autumn of 1927.[93] In fact, he did not turn to the task until the end of February 1928.

The lectures deal with the self-constitution of the "phenomenological time" that underlies the temporal constitution of the pure data of sensation. They stem from Husserl's lecture course of the winter semester 1904–1905, "Major Points in the Phenomenology and Theory of Knowledge," and specifically from the concluding fourth section of the course (February 1905) entitled "Phenomenology of Internal Time-consciousness" or equally "On the Phenomenology of Time." The manuscript was a very complicated affair. Husserl's original, handwritten text of the lectures had been heavily (and controversially) edited and then typed out by Edith Stein in the summer of 1917.[94] It was these pages (not the original manuscript, written in shorthand)

---

[92] See Vincente Marrero, *Guardini, Picasso, Heidegger (Tres Visitas)*, Madrid, 1959, p. 43f.: "No faltan en Friburgo quienes digan que las lecciones de Husserl sobre el tiempo, publicados con antelación a todo esto por el mismo Heidegger en la *Jahrbuch*, no escondieron otro propósito que mostrar las diferentes concepciones que había entre su maestro y la suya."

[93] See the editor's introduction to Edmund Husserl, *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins (1893–1917)*, Husserliana: *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. X, ed. Rudolf Boehm, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966, p. xxiii–xxiv. Boehm bases his remarks in part on recollections that Heidegger shared with him: see p. xxiii, n. 1. Boehm's introduction, with this information, is not found in the E.T.: Edmund Husserl, *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*, trans. John Barnett Brough, *Collected Works*, ed. Rudolf Bernet, IV, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991. This E.T. supplants the earlier one by James S. Churchill, *The Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

[94] The complexities of the text – and the strong redactional role of Edith Stein – are discussed in the editor's introduction to Husserl, *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins*, especially pp. xix–xxi, and in the introduction to the E.T. by John Barnett Brough, *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*, pp. xi–xviii. Cf. Ms. Stein's remarks on the matter ("I have just come upon the bundle on *Zeitbewußtsein*... a rather sorry mess.... Still I am very eager to see whether it can be made into some kind of monograph" etc.): German text in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 23 (1962), pp. 171–173; E.T., Edith Stein, *Self-Portrait in Letters, 1916–1942*, trans. Josephine Koeppel, *Collected Works*, ed. by L. Gelber and Romaeus Leuven, vol. 5, Washington, D.C.: Institute of Carmelite Studies, 1993, pp. 18–21.

that Husserl consigned to Heidegger on Wednesday, February 29, 1928.[95] Contrary to Husserl's implied wishes, Heidegger preferred to make virtually no redactional improvements to the text. Instead, after a careful review, he chose simply to publish the manuscript exactly as Edith Stein had left it.[96]

Husserl was not pleased with this *laissez-faire* approach to the edition. He even had to correct Heidegger's proposed title for the lectures just a few months before the book went to press. Heidegger had suggested that they be called simply "*Time-Consciousness*." Husserl wrote to him: "Do we really want to call it just 'Time-Consciousness'? Shouldn't it be 'On the Phenomenology of Inner Time-Consciousness' or 'On the Phenomenology of Immanent Time-Consciousness'?"[97] Moreover, in his brief Foreword to the edition Heidegger went out of his way to allude to a fundamental reservation he had about Husserl's work. Noting that, in comparison with Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen*, these lectures provided a much-needed, indeed indispensable, fleshing out of the notion of intentionality, Heidegger declared: "Yet even today this term 'intentionality' is not a slogan for a solution but the title of a central *problem*."[98]

The book appeared later in 1928,[99] but over the years Husserl would never be happy with Heidegger's edition. The text had hardly come out before Husserl was referring to it as "the virtually unreadable notes ["die... literarisch fast unmöglichen Notizen"] on my 1905 lectures that Heidegger recently published."[100] Some three years later Dorion Cairns recorded Husserl's continuing regret that "the time lectures were published as they were," as well as

---

[95] On Wednesday, February 29, 1928, Husserl and Heidegger met in Freiburg as they were going their separate ways to vacations in the Black Forest (Heidegger to Todtnauberg, Husserl to Breitnau). Husserl gave Heidegger the manuscript of the lectures on time-consciousness so that Heidegger could begin editing them. See Husserl/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, pp. 90–1 (February 25 and March 6, 1928, Heidegger to Jaspers); Husserl *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 152 (March 5, 1928, to Heidegger),

[96] Ironically, on the first of the galley pages the author of the text was designated as "Martin Heidegger" rather than Edmund Husserl. Heidegger caught the error. See *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 158 (July 10, 1928, Malvine Husserl to Heidegger).

[97] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 157 (May 9, 1928, to Heidegger). See Husserl's letter to Ingarden, *Briefwechsel* III, p. 214 (July 28, 1928): "[The lectures will soon be published] unchanged, merely cleaned up a bit as regards style, and edited by Heidegger. I didn't even get to see the revisions."

[98] "Auch heute noch ist dieser Ausdruck kein Losungswort, sondern der Titel eines zentralen *Problems*." *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, IX (1928), 367; reprinted in Husserl, *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins*, p. xxiv-xxv, here p. xxv; and found in the earlier E.T. by James S. Churchill, *The Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness*, p. 15. Here Heidegger was only echoing what he had told his students one year before, on May 11, 1927: "Nonetheless, it must be said that this enigmatic phenomenon of intentionality is far from having been adequately grasped philosophically." Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, p. 81; cf. pp. 89–90; *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, p. 54; cf. p. 64.

[99] Edmund Husserl, "Vorlesungen zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewußtseins," *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* IX (1928), 367–498 [=*Hu* X, 3–134], with Heidegger's "Vorbemerkung des Herausgebers" on pp. 367–338 [=*Hu* X, xxiv–xxv]. Cf. also *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 356 (June 29, 1928, Malvine Husserl to Elisabeth Rosenberg) and III, 241 (July 13, 1928, Husserl to Ingarden).

[100] *Briefwechsel* V, p. 186 (December 26, 1928, to Rickert).

his dissatisfaction with "Heidegger's insufficient introduction" – even though Husserl had earlier told Heidegger that the introduction was "entirely appropriate" ("Durchaus angemessen!")[101]

Heidegger's Return to Freiburg (Autumn, 1928) and Husserl's Close Reading of Heidegger's Works (Summer, 1929)

Husserl had worked hard over the years to guarantee that Heidegger would succeed him in the chair of philosophy (Seminar I) at the Albert Ludwig's University in Freiburg. However, by the time that Husserl was ready to retire and the offer was made to Heidegger (February 1928), the split between the two philosophers had widened beyond repair. If *Sein und Zeit* was not enough, the three works that Heidegger published in 1929 – "Vom Wesen des Grundes," *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, and "Was ist Metaphysik?" – confirmed beyond a shadow of a doubt how far apart the two philosophers had grown.[102]

Once Heidegger moved to Freiburg in the autumn of 1928, personal contacts between the two philosophers grew less and less frequent,[103] and the "life of profound intellectual exchange and steady philosophical continuity,"[104] which Husserl had long hoped for, vanished like smoke. In Husserl's eyes it was not just that he had lost one more disciple. Heidegger was intended to be *the* disciple, whose assigned role was to preserve and advance Husserl's work after the Master's demise. But the disciple chose to ignore his mission.

Eventually Heidegger admitted as much. On April 8, 1929, as he publicly presented Husserl with a collection of essays in celebration of his seventieth birthday and in honor of his life's work, Heidegger said: "The works we

---

[101] (1) "Insufficient introduction": Dorion Cairns, *Conversations with Husserl and Fink*, ed. by the Husserl-Archives, The Hague: Nijhoff, 1976, pp. 16 and 28. (2) "Durchaus angemessen": *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 156 (May 9, 1928, to Heidegger).

[102] (1) "Vom Wesen des Grundes" was part of the Festschrift for Husserl. Even though the volume was not officially published until May 14, 1929, it was available in some form by the time of the celebration, April 8, 1929. (2) *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* appeared at least by July of 1929 (Jaspers received a copy between July 7 and 14: Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, pp. 123, 124). On April 12, 1929 Heidegger had said he expected it to be printed in May (Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 30), but in fact he wrote the preface to the book only on May 12, 1929. Heidegger's handwritten dedication in Husserl's copy of the book ("Mit herzlichem Gruß. / M. Heidegger") is undated. (3) *Was ist Metaphysik?* appeared only around Christmas of 1929. Heidegger's handwritten dedication in Husserl's copy ("Edmund Husserl / in aller Verehrung und Freundschaft überreicht / Martin Heidegger") is dated "Christmas 1929"; cf. also Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 34.

[103] "...from the very beginning after he moved here (with the exception of the first few months) he stopped coming to visit me...": *Briefwechsel* III, p. 473 (January 8, 1931, to Mahnke). "I see him once every couple months, less frequently than I see my other colleagues": II, 183 (January 6, 1931, to Pfänder), E.T. in Appendix below.

[104] *Briefwechsel* II, p. 182 (to Pfänder, January 6, 1931); also IV, 269 (to Landgrebe, October 1, 1931).

present you are merely a testimony that we *wanted* to follow your leadership, not proof that we succeeded in becoming your disciples."[105] It was downhill from then on.

That summer, 1929, Husserl began a close and very critical reading of Heidegger's recent texts. As he wrote to Pfänder: "Immediately after the printing of my last book [*Formale und transzendentale Logik*], in order to come to a clear-headed and definitive position on Heideggerian philosophy, I dedicated two months to studying *Sein und Zeit*, as well as his more recent writings."[106] Those other writings were *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, which had just appeared, and "Vom Wesen des Grundes" (although Husserl's personal copy has only two insignificant marks in it). This was Husserl's second time[107] through *Sein und Zeit*. In the middle of this effort Husserl attended Heidegger's official Inaugural Lecture at Freiburg University, "What is Metaphysics?" (July 24, 1929), a text that only confirmed the abyss between the two philosophers.

Husserl continued his close reading and note-taking during his vacation in Tremezzo, Italy (August 15 to September 5, 1929), on the west shore of Lake Como.[108] There, as his wife would later recall, Husserl "worked through Heidegger's book thoroughly."[109] From this three-week vacation, as well as the six weeks previous, stem all of Husserl's notes in *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* and presumably many of those in *Sein und Zeit*. The results of those readings, spread over the margins of both works, appear in Part Three of this volume. They are almost entirely negative. Husserl summed up his study of Heidegger in one heavy sentence: "I came to the conclusion that I can *not* admit his work within the framework of my phenomenology and unfortunately that I also must reject it entirely as regards its method, and in the essentials as regards its content."[110] His later remark to Dietrich Mahnke was even stronger: "...I came to the conclusion that his 'phenomenology' has nothing to do with

---

[105] In Appendix below.

[106] *Briefwechsel* II, p. 184 (January 6, 1931, to Pfänder). Husserl sent off the last corrections to *Formale und transzendentale Logik* on July 3, 1929, and the book appeared by the end of the month. Husserl's remark here could refer to either date, thus making the "two months" refer to July-August or to August-September, 1929.

[107] See Fritz Heinemann, *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*, New York: Harper & Row, 1953, p. 48: "In 1931 he [i.e., Husserl] told me that he had taken [Heidegger] most seriously, that he had read his *Sein und Zeit* twice, but that he could not discover anything in it." German translation: *Existenzphilosophie – lebendig oder tot?* second, expanded edition, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1956 (first edition, 1954), p. 49.

[108] The Husserls lodged at the hotel Villa Cornelia in Tremezzo. Earlier in the year, between May 15/16 and June 10, 1929, they had already vacationed at the same place. (Their hotel-mishap, due to the actions of some local Fascists, is mentioned in *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 364 [May 21, 1929, Malvine Husserl to Elisabeth Rosenberg].)

[109] "...in unserem Sommerurlaub am Comer See hat er gründlich Heideggers Buch durchgearbeitet..." *Briefwechsel* III, p. 255 (December 2, 1929, Malvine Husserl to Pfänder).

[110] *Briefwechsel* III, p. 254 (December 2, 1929, to Ingarden); cf. also VI, 277 (August 3, 1929, to Misch), VI, 181 (March 15, 1930, to Hicks), II, 180–184 (January 6, 1931, to Pfänder).

mine and that I view his pseudo-scientificity as an obstacle to the development of philosophy.... I separate my phenomenology completely from Heidegger's so-called phenomenology."[111] In the end, and no doubt sadly, he wrote out in pencil on the title page of *Sein und Zeit*, right opposite Heidegger's handwritten dedication of 1926: "Amicus Plato, magis amica veritas."[112]

Dénouement: 1929 to 1931 and beyond

Upon returning from Tremezzo to Freiburg (early September 1929), Husserl composed his "Nachwort zu meinen *Ideen...*,"[113] which reasserted his own doctrines against philosophers like Heidegger, "who set aside the phenomenological reduction as a philosophically irrelevant eccentricity (whereby, to be sure, they destroy the whole meaning of the work and of my phenomenology), and leave nothing remaining but an *a priori* psychology....."[114] A few months later he went further in a letter to George Dawes Hicks of Cambridge: "...Heidegger absolutely does not follow my method and does anything but advance the descriptive and intentional phenomenology sketched out in my *Ideas*."[115] Husserl further specified the charge some years later, intimating that Heidegger and others confused the phenomenological reduction with the eidetic reduction and thus mistakenly took Husserl for a Platonist.[116] In perhaps kinder moments Husserl attributed Heidegger's heresies either to the disorientation of the Great War or to inadequate philosophical training. "The war and ensuing difficulties drive men into mysticism," he told Dorion Cairns (August 13, 1931) with clear reference to Heidegger.[117]

Convinced that Heidegger was the "antipodes"[118] of all he stood for and represented "the greatest danger" to his own philosophy,[119] Husserl took the occasion of a lecture tour in June of 1931 to attack him. In "Phenomenology

---

[111] *Briefwechsel* III, p. 473 (January 8, 1931, to Mahnke).

[112] "Plato is my friend, but a greater friend is truth."

[113] "Nachwort zu meinen *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*." The text was completed by October 20, 1929, and was published by November 1930 in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* XI (1930), 549–570; E.T., "Author's Preface to the English Edition," in Edmund Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, translated by W. R. Boyce Gibson, New York: Macmillian, 1931, pp. 11–30; reprinted New York: Collier, 1962, pp. 5–25; translated by Fred Kersten, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.

[114] here, p. 16.

[115] *Briefwechsel* VI, p. 181 (March 15, 1930, to Hicks).

[116] *Briefwechsel* VI, p. 429 (March 28, 1934, to Stenzel).

[117] Dorion Cairns, *Conversations with Husserl and Fink*, The Hague: Nijhoff, 1976, p. 9.

[118] *Briefwechsel* III, p. 274 (April 19, 1931, to Roman Ingarden). Husserl also includes Max Scheler in this category.

[119] To Cairns, June 27, 1931: *Conversations with Husserl and Fink*, p. 106.

and Anthropology," delivered in three German cities,[120] Husserl severely criticized Heidegger for claiming that "the true foundation of philosophy" lies "in an eidetic doctrine of one's concrete-worldly existence" ("*in einer Wesenslehre seines konkret-weltlichen Daseins*").[121] Heidegger, who read about Husserl's lecture in a journalistic article, was much irked by the criticism.[122] The matter appeared to rile him even in his later years.[123]

Even when it was clear to both men that their relationship was over, they still kept up appearances for a while. Husserl invited Heidegger to his home for a "philosophers' tea" on June 22, 1930, and for the fiftieth anniversary of Husserl's doctorate on January 23, 1933 (a week before Hitler came to power). Heidegger accepted both invitations.[124]

Nonetheless, it was over. The years 1927 to 1931 witnessed the end to what Husserl would later and bitterly refer to as "this supposed bosom friendship between philosophers."[125] By 1932 not just philosophical but also personal and political differences began to emerge, specifically over Heidegger's increasingly vocal anti-Semitism[126] and eventually his public adherence to

---

[120] Husserl delivered "Phenomenology and Anthropology" to members of the Kantgesellschaft in Frankfurt (June 1, 1931, by invitation of Max Horkheimer), Berlin (June 10), and Halle (June 16). (The date "1932" given in *Hu* IX, p. 615, second paragraph, is erroneous.) The lecture was first published under the title "Phänomenologie und Anthropologie" in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 2 (1941), 1–14. The definitive version appears in Edmund Husserl, *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1922–1937), Gesammelte Werke*, XXVII, ed. Thomas Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1989, pp. 164–181, with critical notes at pp. 300–307. English translation by Richard G. Schmitt in *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*, ed. Roderick M. Chisholm, New York and Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960, pp. 129–142, and in Edmund Husserl, *Shorter Works*, ed. Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston, South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1981, pp. 315–323. A new and improved translation appears in the Appendix, below.

[121] Husserl, *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1922–1937)*, p. 164. For Husserl's charge that Heidegger's work is "anthropology" see *Briefwechsel* VI, p. 277 (August 3, 1929, to Misch) and III, p. 478 (May 12, 1931, to Mahnke).

[122] Heidegger read Heinrich Mühsam's report on the lecture, "Die Welt wird eingeklammert," *Unterhaltungsblatt der Vossischen Zeitung* (June 12, 1931). Years later in his *Spiegel*-interview (1966) Heidegger would confuse this Heinrich Mühsam with the German poet, playwright, and anarchist Erich Mühsam, who died in a Nazi concentration camp in 1934. See Martin Heidegger, "Nur noch ein Gott kann uns retten," *Der Spiegel*, 23 (May 31, 1976), p. 199; E.T. "'Only a God Can Save Us': The *Spiegel* Interview (1966)," trans. William J. Richardson, in Thomas Sheehan, ed., *Heidegger, the Man and the Thinker*, Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers U.P./Transaction Publishers, 1981, p. 51. Also Karl Schuhmann, "Zu Heideggers *Spiegel*-Gespräch über Husserl," *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, 32 (1978), 603–608.

[123] For the earliest record (autumn, 1945) of Heidegger's vexation at reading the Mühsam article see Alfred de Towarnicki, "Visite à Martin Heidegger," *Temps modernes*, 1, 4 (1945–1946), p. 716. For the remarks he made in 1996 see the *Spiegel*-interview (previous footnote).

[124] *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 378 (June 22, 1930) and IX, 416 (January 25, 1933): both letters are from Malvine Husserl to Elisabeth Rosenberg.

[125] *Briefwechsel* III, p. 493 (May 4–5, 1933, to Mahnke).

[126] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 289 (May 28, 1932, to Landgrebe) and III, 493 (May 4/5, 1933, to Mahnke); on Heidegger's treatment of Eduard Baumgarten: IX, 406 (May 31, 1932, to Elisabeth Rosenberg), IX 401, 409 (February 3 and June 21, 1932: Malvine Husserl to Elisabeth Rosenberg). See also the anecdotes that Eduard Baumgarten related to David Luban: Berel Lang, *Heidegger's Silence*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996, pp. 104–108.

National Socialism.[127] These matters, however, are not our direct concern here, nor is the question of Heidegger's absence from Husserl's funeral (April 29, 1938) or his later, and contradictory, explanations of that matter.[128]

[127] See, for example, *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 290–1 (to Ingarden, December 11, 1933): "Heidegger is the National-Socialist rector (in accordance with the *Führer*-principle) in Freiburg, and likewise from now on the leader of the reform of the universities in the new Reich."

[128] See Schuhmann, "Zu Heideggers *Spiegel*-Gespräch über Husserl," pp. 611–612. Also, Antonio Gnoli and Franco Volpi's interview with Hermann Heidegger, "Mio padre, un genio normale," *La Repubblica* (Rome), April 12, 1996, pp. 38–39; and Hugo Ott, "Der eine fehlte, der nicht hätte fehlen dürfen: Heidegger," *Badische Zeitung*, Nr. 191 (August 19, 1996). I am grateful to Prof. Hans Seigfried for pointing out this last article.

PART ONE

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA ARTICLE (1927–1928)

THE HISTORY OF THE REDACTION OF THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE

Thomas Sheehan

Outline

Draft A (September, 1927)
- The outline of Draft A
- Getting Heidegger involved
- Various schedules for meeting at Husserl's home

Draft B (October 10–22, 1927)
- Draft B, Section ii-a (before October 10)
- Heidegger's critique of Draft A (beginning October 10)
- The "second elaboration" of the Article (up to October 20)
- The projected outline of the new draft
- The order in which the Sections of Draft B were written
  - Section ii-b
  - Section iii
  - Section i
- Heidegger's work on Section iii (October 20–22)

From Draft B to Draft C (late October 1927)
- The dialogue of the deaf
- What Draft B accomplished

Draft C (after October 23, 1927)
- The dating of Draft C
- The title of Draft C
- The Introduction to Draft C

Draft D (November 1927)
- The dating of Draft D
- The writing of Draft D

Draft E (December 1, 1927 to February [March?] 1928)
- Christopher V. Salmon
- A chronology of Draft E

From Draft E to Draft F (March 1928 to September 1929)
- The structures of Drafts E and F
- The lifespan of Draft F: 1929–1956

THE HISTORY OF THE REDACTION OF THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE

Thomas Sheehan

Husserl's writing and redacting of the EB Article extended from early September 1927 through at least February 1928. The present introduction, in the form of a *Redaktionsgeschichte*, focuses on the development of the drafts of the Article, and particularly the first and second drafts. The pioneering editorial work of Professor Walter Biemel, published in *Hu* IX, is the indispensable foundation for what follows.[1] To his work we have added our own close study of the available manuscripts in the light of other materials, and we place this research in the appendix following the present introduction. It is indispensable for understanding the intricate and often puzzling questions pertaining to the chronology of drafts of the Article.

It is not known exactly when in 1927 James Louis Garvin, British editor of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, contacted Husserl with an invitation to write the entry "Phenomenology" for the new, fourteenth edition.[2] No relevant letter

[1] Prof. Biemel provides an earlier (1950) and a later (1962) description of the manuscripts of the EB Article (which are catalogued in the Husserl-Archives as M III 10). Only the later description, which is found in *Hu* IX (1962), pp. 590–591, is correct. The earlier description is almost entirely wrong and should be discarded. It is found in Walter Biemel, "Husserls Encyclopaedia-Britannica Artikel und Heideggers Anmerkungen dazu," *Tijdschrift voor Philosophie*, 12 (1950), p. 247–248, n. 1; in E.T., "Husserl's *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article and Heidegger's Remarks Thereon," trans. P. McCormick and F. Elliston in *Husserl: Expositions and Appraisals*, p. 303, n. 1. As regards the later description of the manuscripts in *Hu* IX, the following printers errors have been found: (1) p. 590, three lines from the bottom: Instead of "264,15" read: "264,1–266,15." (2) p. 591.2: Instead of "Gruppe 1" read "Gruppe 2." (3) p. 591, ten lines from the bottom: Instead of "M III 10 4" read: "M III 10 III 4." (4) p. 605, re 277.22: Add "Letzte Ausarbeitung" to the title of C2: cf. the same title at p. 591. (5) At p. 607.20–21, Biemel attributes an interlinear remark in C2, p. 6.8 ("seelischer Innerlichkeiten?") to Heidegger, whereas it is virtually certain that Heidegger did not read C2. The words may stem from Ingarden.

[2] The *thirteenth* edition of the *Britannica* had appeared in 1926, but, like the twelfth edition of 1922, it consisted only of supplements (even if extraordinary ones – by Trotsky and Einstein, for example) to the famous eleventh edition brought out by Hugh Chisholm in 1911. The *fourteenth* edition would remain in print (with revisions) from 1929 until 1974. The *fifteenth* edition (1974 to the present; designed by Mortimer Adler) carries a new sub-title – "The New *Encyclopaedia Britannica*" – which replaced the subtitle that had

has been found in Husserl's papers, and in 1993 the Editorial Offices of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.* reported that the company's correspondence with Husserl was destroyed after the edition appeared. We do know that in April 1927 Garvin set September 1929 as the target date for publication of the new *Britannica* (that goal was, in fact, met), and that sometime after February of 1928 the final English version of Husserl's Article was completed by Christopher V. Salmon. The first recorded mention of the EB Article comes on September 30, 1927, in Husserl's letter to his friend Paul Jensen of Göttingen:[3]

> ...I have had to work hard, and perhaps a bit too much, during this vacation period, in the last instance on another article, entitled "Phenomenology," for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.* It also proved to be quite difficult since I was held to a very restricted length (equal to about twelve pages of the *Jahrbuch*). But it finally turned out to my satisfaction.[4]

What follows is a hypothetical reconstruction, with a reasonably high degree of probability, of how events unfolded over the six months between the inception of the Article and its being sent to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in London – that is, the three months when Husserl was drafting the Article (September through early December 1927) and the three months when it was in the hands of Christopher V. Salmon (December 1927 to at least February 1928). At the Husserl-Archives, the EB Article is considered to have gone through four drafts, which, following Professor Biemel's guidelines, we call Drafts A, B, C, and D. Whereas Drafts A and B are clearly distinct from each other, and while Draft D presents the Article in its complete and final form (though not the form in which it was published), there is, nonetheless, considerable fluidity between drafts B, C and D. In what follows we focus chiefly on A and B. These are the only drafts on which Heidegger worked, and the evidence for their redactional history is the clearest.

---

been used from 1768 through 1973: "A New Survey of Universal Knowledge." Beginning in 1928 the *Britannica* was owned by Sears, Roebuck, and Co., which was the company that paid Husserl for his Article. The fourteenth edition of the Encyclopaedia was printed in Chicago and was published in September 1929 (just weeks before the New York Stock Market crashed) at an estimated cost of $2.5 million. See Eugene P. Sheehy, ed., *Guide to Reference Books*, 10th ed., Chicago: American Library Association, 1986, pp. 134–135; and Herman Kogan, *The Great EB*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958, chapters 17 and 18.

[3] The first edition of Karl Schuhmann's *Husserl-Chronik*, p. 320, incorrectly indicates that Husserl's earliest mention of the Article dates to a letter of "3.II.27" (i.e., February 3, 1927) written to Gustav Albrecht. I am grateful to Prof. Karl Schuhmann for clarifying (in his letter of August 12, 1994) that "3.II.27," is a misprint for "13.XI.27."

[4] *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 306. A *Jahrbuch* page averaged about 360 words; hence the article was limited to around 4000 words. Salmon's condensed translation comes to 3844 words without bibliography, 4017 with bibliography.

THE DRAFTS OF THE EB ARTICLE IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER ARCHIVAL SIGNATURE: M III 10

	FIRST DRAFT ("A")	
—	A0	original shorthand text by Husserl: lost
—	A00	typed copy of the original shorthand text: lost
III 2	A2	first carbon copy of the typed original: "Freiburg copy"
III 1	A1	second carbon copy of the typed original: "Todtnauberg copy"
	SECOND DRAFT ("B")	
III 3	B1	typed original: working copy, incomplete.
	B2	first carbon copy, complete and clean. Sections i, ii-a, ii-b, iii.
	B3	second carbon copy, "Messkirch copy." Section iii only.
	THIRD DRAFT ("C")	
III 6	C1	typed original: incomplete
III 4	C2	carbon copy; incomplete working copy
III 5	C3	carbon copy; only complete copy of Draft C
	FOURTH DRAFT ("D")	
I 1	D1	complete fourth draft: typed original
I 2	D2	incomplete carbon copy of D1: second carbon
—	D3	complete carbon copy of D1, sent to Salmon: lost
	SALMON'S ABRIDGED TRANSLATION ("E")	
—	E1a	First draft: typed original: lost
II 2	E1b	First draft: carbon copy (sent to Husserl)
II 1	E2a	Second draft, correction of E1: typed (sent to Husserl)
—	E2b	Copy of E2a, sent to *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: lost.
	PUBLISHED VERSION ("F")	
—	F	Edited version of E2b, published

THE *CATALOGUED* ORDER OF "M III 10" IN THE HUSSERL ARCHIVES

I	1	carbon copy [D1]		pp.	1a, 1b, 10–11, 11a, 11b 12–29, 29b, 30–1	FOURTH DRAFT [D]
	2	carbon copy [D2]		pp.	1, 2, 5–15, 17, 24–29	
II	1	Salmon's second draft typed original [E2a]		pp.	1–22 + i–ii and 1–2	SALMON'S ABRIDGED TRANSLATION [E]
	2	Salmon's first draft carbon copy[7] [E1b]		pp.	1–13;17–9;21–2;i–ii and 1–2[5,6]	
III	1	second carbon: [A1]		pp.	1–23, plus 5a and 7a (p. 24–25 are found in E1b)	FIRST DRAFT [A]
	2	first carbon:[8] [A2]		pp.	1–24, plus 5a and 7a (p. 25 = missing)	
	3	typed original: [B1]	i	pp.	1–11	SECOND DRAFT [B]
			ii-a	pp.	12–14 <1–3>	
			–	–	– missing	
			iii	pp.	21–28	
		first carbon: [B2]	i	pp.	1–11	
			ii-a	pp.	12–14 <1–3>	
			ii-b	pp.	15–20 <4–9>	
			iii	pp.	21–28 <10–17>	
		second carbon: [B3]	–	–	– non-existent	
			–	–	– non-existent	
			–	–	– non-existent	
			iii	pp.	21–28	
	4	carbon copy: [C2]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1–13, plus 8a; 13a,b; 14–18, 20, 22–25, 28–42, 43 (second half), 44–45.	THIRD DRAFT [C]
	5	carbon copy: [C3]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1–13, plus 8a; 13a,b; 14–45	
	6	typed original [C1]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1–2,5–13, plus 8a; 15–18, 20, 22–25, 28–30, 43 (first half)	

[5] Pp. 24–25 of Draft A1 (i.e., the last lines of the German draft plus the two pages of bibliography) are attached to the end of this text.

[6] Here and in the following draft, p. i is the cover sheet, and p. ii is the introductory paragraph, whereas pp. 1–2 are the bibliography at the end. Concerning the missing pages, see *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 152 (March 5, 1928, Husserl to Heidegger).

[7] The original is lost.

[8] The original is lost.

Draft A
(September 1927)

The composing of Draft A: Husserl wrote Draft A, the first version of the Article, in September 1927. He began the work while on vacation in Switzerland (September 1–15) and finished it thereafter at his home in Freiburg.[9] This original text, written in Gabelsberg shorthand, came to some 5000 words, and has since been lost. We call it Draft A0.

Not long after September 15 Husserl had Ludwig Landgrebe, his research assistant at Freiburg University, type out this shorthand manuscript into twenty-five double-spaced pages, with two carbon copies.[10] After studying the typed version, Husserl added two more pages, numbered as "5a" and "7a," for a total of twenty-seven pages. This original typescript of the shorthand version of Draft A has since been lost. We call it Draft A00. However, the two carbon copies have survived, and we refer to them as Draft A1 and Draft A2.[11]

The outline of Draft A: Draft A is formally divided into two parts – "Psychological Phenomenology as 'Pure' Phenomenology" and "Transcendental Phenomenology as Contrasted with Psychological Phenomenology." However, it actually deals with *three* topics that would continue to occupy Husserl throughout all the drafts for the Article. And as a sign of the tentativeness of the draft, the second of the three topics – the historical treatment of phenomenology – is awkwardly split between the Parts I and II:

---

[9] On the vacation in Switzerland: *Briefwechsel* VIII, p. 39, n. 2, correcting Edmund Husserl, *Briefe an Ingarden*, ed. Roman Ingarden, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968, p. 152.

[10] Page 1 through the first half of p. 24 is double-spaced; the bibliography (second half of p. 24, plus p. 25) is single-spaced.

[11] On p. 1 of Draft A2 Husserl writes in pencil: "Erste Entwurf 1–21" ("First Draft, [pp.] 1–21"). However, A00 was made up of twenty-*five* pages, numbered 1–25, with two inserted pages numbered "5a" and "7a."

DRAFT A GENERAL OUTLINE OF MAIN TOPICS		
Part I	1.	Pure phenomenological psychology (grounded in the phenomenological and eidetic reductions) as the basis for rigorous empirical psychology.
Part II	2.	The historical intertwining of psychological and transcendental phenomenology, and the need to distinguish between them in order to avoid psychologism.
	3.	Transcendental experience achieved by the transcendental reduction. Universal transcendental philosophy.

Getting Heidegger involved: Heidegger finished his course "Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie" on July 27, 1927 and left Marburg for his summer vacation in Todtnauberg probably on August 7. In the following days Husserl invited him from Todtnauberg to Freiburg for a fairly long visit (Heidegger returned to his cabin in the week of August 14–20), during which they discussed, among other things, the EB Article which Husserl was about to draft.[12] Husserl asked Heidegger for three things: (1) that Heidegger read and comment on the EB Article when it would be finished; (2) that he read and comment on a second typed manuscript, entitled "Studien zur Struktur des Bewußtseins" ("Studies on the Structure of Consciousness"), which likewise dealt with pure phenomenological psychology; and (3) that Heidegger visit Husserl in Freiburg, beginning on October 10, in order to discuss these two texts.

In early September Heidegger set aside his own work[13] in order to begin reading the "Studies on the Structure of Consciousness." The manuscript, which Husserl had been working on since 1926, consisted of three interrelated studies: "Activity and Passivity," "Value-Constitution, Mind, Will," and "Modalities and Tendency." The manuscript that Heidegger read represented

[12] See Heidegger's letter to Karl Löwith, August 20, 1927, in Dietrich Papenfuss and Otto Pöggeler, eds. *Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers,* II, 33 and 34; English translation by Gary Steiner in Karl Löwith, *Martin Heidegger and European Nihilism,* ed. Richard Wolin, New York: Columbia University Press, 1995, pp. 239 and 240.

[13] Heidegger had been rereading Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* in preparation for his autumn lecture course, "Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants *Kritik der reinen Vernunft.*" The course, edited by Ingtraud Görland, has been published under that same title in *Gesamtausgabe* II/25, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977.

Husserl's second draft of the project.[14]

After returning from vacation (September 15), Husserl had Landgrebe type up his shorthand Draft A0. Then, no doubt impressing upon Heidegger the urgency of the task,[15] he sent the second carbon copy of the Article to Heidegger in Todtnauberg for his critical comments, while keeping A2 and the now-lost typed original, A00, with himself in Freiburg. Hence, we may designate A1 as the "Todtnauberg copy" of the Article and A2 as the "Freiburg copy."

Various schedules for meeting at Husserl's home: By September 27 Heidegger had settled on his end-of-vacation plans. He would depart Todtnauberg (leaving his wife and two children there) on October 10, visit Husserl for two days, then visit with his brother Fritz in Messkirch. Finally he would go on to visit Karl Jaspers for a week in Heidelberg before returning to Marburg to begin teaching.[16] These plans would change three times over the next three weeks, each time, it seems, because Husserl requested a longer visit in order to work together redacting the EB Article. Heidegger's first program for traveling from Todtnauberg to Marburg was roughly as follows:[17]

Original plan (September 27, 1927)	
October 10–11:	visit with Husserl (Monday and Tuesday)
October 11–16:	visit with his brother Fritz in Messkirch
October 16–24:	stay with Jaspers in Heidelberg
October 24:	return to Marburg

In late September and/or early October Heidegger read Draft A1 of the EB Article, at least up through page 17, where his last marginal note appears. The

---

[14] In his letter of October 22, 1927 from Messkirch, Heidegger mentions having read yet a second time ("Ich habe ihn jetzt noch einmal durchgelesen") "the three sections of the manuscript that Landgrebe typed" ("den drei Abschnitten des von Landgrebe getippten Ms."), and he refers to these texts as "the second draft for the 'Studien'" ("den zweiten Entwurf für die 'Studien'"). Heidegger adjudges the text to contain "the essential elements" of "a pure psychology" ("reine Psychologie...die wesentlichen Stücke") and urges Husserl to publish this research (*Hu* IX, p. 601; E.T. in Appendices to Draft B, infra). The typescript of this manuscript, kept at the Husserl-Archives under the signature M III 3, is in three parts: I. Aktivität und Passivität; II. Wertkonstitution, Gemüt, Wille; and III. Modalitäten und Tendenz.

[15] Cf. Heidegger's letter to Husserl, October 22, 1927: "Diesmal stand alles unter dem Druck einer dringenden und wichtigen Aufgabe." *Hu* IX, p. 600.

[16] A major motive for Heidegger's trip to Messkirch was to visit the grave of his mother, who had died in his absence five months earlier. See Heidegger's letter to Dietrich Mahnke, October 21, 1927: Ms. 862 (Nachlaß Mahnke) der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg: "Da ich hier in meiner Heimat nach das Grab meiner in diesem Sommer verstorbenen Mutter besuchen will...." Also Heidegger's remarks to Jaspers in their *Briefwechsel*, p. 79 (September 27, 1927). That this visit was part of the original plan can be deduced from Heidegger/Jaspers *Briefwechsel*, p. 82 (October 19, 1927): "Ich fahre *erst heute* nach meiner Heimat...," emphasis added.

[17] Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, p. 79 (September 27, 1927): "Heute möchte ich nur fragen, ob Sie bzw. Ihre Frau mich als Gast brauchen können nach dem 15. Oktober." That the stay with Jaspers was planned to last something like eight days is presumed from *ibid.*, p. 81 (October 6, 1927).

comments that he wrote into Draft A1 were quite minimal, mostly minor corrections to the text and rephrasings of Husserl's prose. They were hardly substantial and, as far as they went, certainly not controversial. Heidegger had also read the "Studien," and sometime before October 6 he communicated his evaluation of this text (and maybe of the EB Article as well) in a letter to Husserl, which is now lost.[18]

It seems that once Husserl had read Heidegger's letter he requested a longer visit with Heidegger than had been planned, no doubt to discuss the issues raised by the two texts and especially by Draft A of the Article. He asked that Heidegger plan to extend his scheduled stay from two days to a *week*. Heidegger agreed and changed his schedule accordingly. On October 6 he wrote to Jaspers that he could not come to Heidelberg by October 16, as at first planned, but only around October 20.[19] Thus, Heidegger's new end-of-vacation plans looked like this:

Second plan (October 6, 1927)	
October 10–17:	visit with Husserl (one week)
October 17–20:	visit with his brother Fritz in Messkirch
October 20–28:	visit with Jaspers in Heidelberg
October 28:	return to Marburg

Heidegger began his visit with Husserl on October 10; but after they had worked together on the Article for a few days, Heidegger's plans changed yet again. The working visit was now extended from six to *ten days*, surely at Husserl's request. This constitutes Heidegger's *third* end-of-vacation schedule. And so on October 19 – ten days into the visit – Heidegger wrote Jaspers to say that only today ("erst heute") was he about to leave for Messkirch. This meant that his trip to Heidelberg could not happen before October 23 or 24.

And yet even after writing that to Jaspers, Heidegger stayed with Husserl *yet one more day*, for a total of *eleven* days of work on the EB Article. He would not leave Freiburg for Messkirch until Thursday, October 20th.[20] Husserl and Heidegger's visit in Freiburg led to a new draft of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article. It also spelled the beginning of the end of their

---

[18] On our hypothesis, this now lost letter is the one that Heidegger refers to in his letter to Husserl dated October 22, 1927: "[Ich] halte mein Urteil im vorigen Brief aufrecht." I date that letter before October 6, 1927 on the hypothesis that this letter (and the "Urteil" that Heidegger expressed in it) led to Husserl's new request that Heidegger extend his visit beyond just two days (see below).

[19] Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, p. 81 (October 6, 1927): "Ich komme erst um den 20. Oktober herum und möchte dann, wenn es Ihnen recht is, acht Tage bleiben."

[20] On Friday, October 21, 1927, Heidegger wrote to Dietrich Mahnke from Messkirch: "Durch eine gemeinsame Arbeit mit Husserl (Artikel über Phänomenologie für die Encycl. Britannica) war ich bis gestern in Freiburg festgehalten." Ms. 862 (Nachlaß Mahnke) der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg.

professional relationship. In any case, Heidegger's fourth and final schedule turned out to be as follows:

Final schedule	
October 10–20:	visit with Husserl (eleven days)[21]
October 20–23:	visit with his brother Fritz in Messkirch
October 23–28:	visit with Jaspers in Heidelberg[22]
October 28/29:	return to Marburg

Draft B
(October 10–22, 1927)

The manuscript of the second draft of the EB Article is made up of four new Sections, all of them distinct with regard to Draft A.[23] The first Section was composed by Heidegger and the last three by Husserl. The material of the second and third Sections is closely related and represents Husserl's attempt to unite the "historical" material of Draft A under one heading. One of our goals is to discern the order in which these Sections were written. The following shows the relations between the four Sections and the corresponding pagination in *Hu* IX:

DRAFT B	
in manuscript	**in *Hu* IX (starting pages)**
Section i	256.1
Section ii-a	264.1
Section ii-b	266.16
Section iii	271.1

Draft B, Section ii-a (before October 10): On September 30 Husserl had told Paul Jensen that Draft A had "turned out to my satisfaction."[24] However,

---

[21] On Wednesday, October 12, Husserl had a social evening at his house for the Oskar Beckers, Heidegger, Paul Hoffman, Erik Honecker, the Fritz Kaufmanns, Ludwig Langrebe, and, from Japan, Baron Shûzô Kuki and his wife. See Schuhmann, *Husserl-Chronik*, p. 325, and Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, p. 157, where Ingarden wrongly reports that "Heidegger had merely come from Marburg for a short visit."

[22] Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 22 (October 21, 1927): "Übermorgen fahre ich bis zum 27. Okt. zu Jaspers nach Heidelberg." However, Heidegger's letter to Mahnke, dated Marburg, Saturday, October 29, 1927, opens: "Eben bin ich angekommen...": Ms. 862 (Nachlaß Mahnke) der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg.

[23] We capitalize the word "Sections" in order to indicate the crucial role these divisions of the text play in the articulation of Draft B. Biemel refers to them as "groups" ("Gruppe"). He distinguishes only three of them (*Hu* IX, p. 591), thereby underplaying the break at the top of B p. 15 (= *Hu* IX, p. 266.15) that leads us to divide Section ii into "a" and "b."

[24] *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 306; see above.

even before Heidegger's arrival, the shortcomings of Draft A had become clear to Husserl. To begin with, the treatment of the history of phenomenology (topic number 2, above) is awkwardly spread over Parts I and II of the draft and is somewhat ragged at best. For example, Part I, §6 discusses the pre-history of *psychological* phenomenology, whereas Part II, §1 deals with the historical transition to *transcendental* phenomenology, but the distinction between the two is not made clearly. Likewise: Part I, §6 discusses Locke but not Descartes; Part II, §1 starts with Descartes, but takes up Locke yet again, and progresses through Brentano's quasi-psychologism to Husserl's transcendental phenomenology. Hardly a neatly organized treatment.

This is why, in late September or early October (in any case, before October 10, when Heidegger arrived in Freiburg), Husserl took to rewriting the second of the three central topics listed above: the question of the historical intertwining of pure psychology and transcendental philosophy and the need to distinguish between the two. Landgrebe typed out the initial results of this new text into three double-spaced pages, with one carbon copy, and he typed page-numbers at the top right-hand corner: 1–3.[25] (This page-numbering will become quite important for determining how the writing of Draft B evolved.) These three pages, intended as a revision of Draft A, in fact turned out to be the first pages to be written of Draft B. They correspond to *Hu* IX, pp. 264.1–266.15, that is, to what we shall call Section ii-a of that new draft.[26] Here and throughout the second draft, the original typescript pages are called B1, and the single carbon copy is called B2.

Heidegger's critique of Draft A (beginning October 10): Heidegger brought Draft A1 (the Todtnauberg copy) with him when he arrived at Husserl's home on October 10. This was the first occasion that either of them had to read the comments and corrections of the other. They exchanged drafts – Husserl got his first look at Heidegger's annotations to the Todtnauberg copy, and Heidegger read through Husserl's amendments to the Freiburg copy. This is the origin of Heidegger's remarks in A2, the Freiburg copy, particularly around p. 7 of the manuscript. As he would write to Husserl a few days later, Heidegger, in the course of their discussions, came to see for the first time

---

[25] As was his custom, Landgrebe left the first typed page unnumbered and typed the page numbers only on the second and third pages. (As regards the Husserl-Archives' *own* penciled page-numbering of Draft B: the pages of B1 that the Archives has page-numbered in pencil as pp. 24, 25, and 26 are in the wrong order. Their correct order should be p. 25, p. 24, p. 26.)

[26] The title that Husserl gives to Draft B2 (the only complete copy of Draft B to survive) is "*Encyclopaedia Britannica.* The attempt at a second elaboration (during Heidegger's stay), pp. 15–28, plus Heidegger's pp. 1–10." ("Encycl Brit *Zum Versuch der zweiten Bearbeitung (während Heid. Anwesenheit)* und *Heid. 1–10*": in Husserl's shorthand on a cover sheet preceding the text of B2: *Hu* IX, p. 597 and in part, p. 590.) The last phrase, "1–10", is a mistake for "1–11." The "second elaboration" does not include the three pages that come between 1–11 and 15–28 – because they were the three pages drafted *before* Heidegger's visit.

> the extent to which your emphasis on pure psychology provides the basis for clarifying – or unfolding for the first time with complete exactness – the question of transcendental subjectivity and its relation to the pure psychic. My disadvantage, to be sure, is that I do not know your concrete investigations of the last few years.[27]

Nonetheless, to judge by Husserl's eventual awareness that the Article had to be rewritten, it seems that Heidegger's critique of Draft A – indeed, of Husserl's entire enterprise as that was summarized in the Article – was perceived by Husserl to be quite trenchant.

(1) As he had since at least 1919, Heidegger contested the centrality of the transcendental ego in Husserl. And specifically as regards this text, he questioned the relation of the transcendental ego to the ego of pure psychology, and ultimately its relation to what Heidegger called "factical Dasein." This would remain a pivotal issue in Heidegger's and Husserl's discussions over these eleven days, as well as in Husserl's rewriting of the Article after the working visit was over.

(2) Connected with the general problem of the transcendental ego was the specific problem of Draft A's severely underdeveloped treatment of the transcendental reduction to the field of transcendental constitution (topic 3 above). Indeed, Draft A spent much more time addressing topics in transcendental *philosophy* (its role in generating a universal phenomenological ontology, in overcoming the foundational crises in the sciences, and in overcoming traditional antitheses) than it did on how one might get access to the field of transcendental *experience* and constitution. For example, in Draft A Husserl touches directly and focally on the transcendental reduction and the transcendental ego in less than thirty lines, whereas he devotes 166 lines (almost five pages) to his sketch of transcendental philosophy.[28]

(3) Likewise there was the problem that, apart from the barest of allusions, Draft A made no attempt to articulate how phenomenological psychology might concretely serve as a propaedeutic to transcendental phenomenology. The most the draft had said in that regard was that "one science turns into the other through a mere change in focus, such that the 'same' phenomena and eidetic insights occur in both sciences, albeit under a different rubric...."[29]

(4) Finally a major issue for Heidegger was the Article's inadequate contex-

---

[27] Letter of October 22, 1927. Compare Heidegger's admission in the classroom on February 7, 1925: "I am not sufficiently conversant with the contents of the present stance of his investigations." *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, p. 168; E.T., *History of the Concept of Time*, p. 121.

[28] Less than thirty lines: *Hu* IX, p. 249.11–19 and 25–34; p. 250.10–16; the 166 lines: *Hu* IX, pp. 250.25–254.38.

[29] Draft A, Part II, §1: pp. 14.27–15.3; = *Hu* IX, p. 247.31–248.2. And in the next sentences Husserl mentions that, historically, Locke looked upon pure psychology only as "the means to a universal solution of the *problem of 'understanding,'*" i.e., transcendental philosophy.

tualization of the entire enterprise of phenomenology – which Heidegger, unlike Husserl, saw primarily (and merely) as a method for doing fundamental ontology. Connected with this was Heidegger's reinterpretation of phenomenological method, a topic he had addressed on May 4, 1927 in his summer semester course, "Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie."[30] Like Husserl, Heidegger saw phenomenological reduction as a matter of refocusing attention on the already operative activity of transcendental constitution. However, Heidegger located that constitution *not* in "consciousness and its noetic-noematic experiences, in which objects are constituted as correlates of consciousness"[31] *but* in the "understanding of being" i.e., the prior, structural ability (indeed, necessity) to take entities only in terms of how they are disclosed.[32] In Heidegger's account, this prior, structural possibility / necessity *is* first-order "constitution" – he called it eksistential "transcendence" *qua* "transcendental." This is what underlies and makes possible *both* the second-order constitutive functions of acts of consciousness *and* the third-order reflective-thematic performances of such things as "transcendental reductions." For Heidegger, the performance of such a reflective-thematic act entails not a "return to consciousness" (a *Zurück*-führung or *re*-duction) so much as a "leading-forward" (*Hin*-führung or *in*-duction: ἐπαγωγή[33]) of one's gaze towards the eksistentially-transcendentally disclosed form of being that lets the entity be understood *as* this or that. In his 1927 course Heidegger calls such an ἐπαγωγή the "Sichhinbringen zum Sein," the "Hinführung zum Sein" or simply "die Leitung."[34]

There were also other, less important difficulties with Draft A, among them the unevenness of Husserl's treatment of the intertwined histories of phenomenological psychology and transcendental philosophy (topic 2 above). But the aggregate of these problems was serious enough to make Husserl decide to put aside the first text and prepare a new one.

The "second elaboration" of the Article (up to October 20): Having read and annotated each other's copies, Husserl and Heidegger settled on a division of labor for producing a new draft of the EB Article. Heidegger would redo

---

[30] For the following see Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, p. 29–32; E.T. p. 21–23. See also the thorough treatment in Burt C. Hopkins, *Intentionality in Husserl and Heidegger: The Problem of the Original Method and Phenomenon of Phenomenology*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1993, Parts Two and Three.

[31] *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, p. 29; E.T. p. 21.

[32] Cf. *ibid.*: "...die Rückführung des phänomenologischen Blickes...auf das Verstehen des Seins (Entwerfen [des Seienden] auf die Weise seiner Unverborgenheit)." See Steven Galt Crowell, "Husserl, Heidegger, and Transcendental Philosophy: Another Look at the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 1, 3 (March 1990), 501–518.

[33] See Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe* II/9, *Wegmarken*, Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1976, pp. 243–4 and 264, where Heidegger interprets ἐπαγωγή as it appears in Aristotle's *Physics*, A 2, 185 a 12f. This term is already present in 1927 in Heidegger's use of *Hinführung* and *Leitung*.

[34] Loc. cit., p. 29; E.T., p. 21.

the introduction and the first half of the Article. That is, (1) he would present the *ontological* contextualization of the entire project by situating phenomenology within his own vision of revitalizing the question of being via an inquiry into the essence of subjectivity; and (2) he would reorganize Part I: the object and method of pure phenomenological psychology, and its function as a foundation for empirical psychology.

Husserl, meanwhile, would continue working on (1) the intertwined historical development of phenomenological psychology and transcendental phenomenology and (2) the need to distinguish between the two. He would also (3) flesh out the all-too-brief paragraphs on transcendental reduction as giving access to the transcendental field, and (4) say something about phenomenological psychology as a propaedeutic to transcendental phenomenology.

But as regards the third main topic listed above – the possible role of universal transcendental philosophy – Husserl considered it to have been handled adequately enough in Draft A and therefore not to need any further attention at this point.

The projected outline of the new draft: The plan, then, was finally to collate their individual work, gathering it around the three new pages that Husserl had already written prior to Heidegger's visit. The resultant new Draft B would consist of four Sections (somewhat awkwardly stitched together among themselves) with the last pages of Draft A added at the end. See the chart "DRAFT B: Overview" on the following page.

The order in which the Sections of Draft B were written: The evidence shows that the chronological order of the writing (or at least the typing) of the Sections of Draft B is as follows:

Before October 10:
Section ii-a

October 10–20:
Section ii-b
Section iii
Section i

	DRAFT B **Overview**	
Section i	**Introduction:** The idea of phenomenology, and the step back to consciousness.	Heidegger
	Part I Pure psychology: Its object, method, and function	Heidegger
	Part II	
Section ii-a continued in Section ii-b	**A.** The historical intertwining of phenomenological psychology and transcendental phenomenology and the need to distinguish them	Husserl
Section iii:	**B.** The transcendental reduction as giving access to the transcendental ego.	
[not drafted]	**Part III** Transcendental Philosophy	Husserl [cf. A, II §2]

The clue to this chronological order lies in determining the specific stages in which the pages of the manuscript, specifically Draft B2 (the first carbon copy) were numbered. I provide that numeration schematically in the chart below and then follow with a narrative presentation of the order in which the Sections were written.

	LANDGREBE'S TYPESCRIPT		PUBLISHED VERSION
	Original pagination	Final pagination	Pages in *Hu* IX
Section i	1–11 typed numbers	1–11 typed numbers	256.1–263.37
Section ii-a	1–3 typed numbers	12–14 hand-numbered	264.1–266.15
Section ii-b	4–9 hand-numbered	15–20 typed numbers	266.16–270.39
Section iii	10–17 hand-numbered	21–28 typed numbers	271.1–277.21

Section ii-b: Before Heidegger had finished drafting Section i, Husserl completed writing Section ii-b and had Landgrebe type up an original (=B1) with only *one* carbon copy (=B2). Since it was not yet known how many pages long Heidegger's Section i would be, Landgrebe did not type page numbers in either the original (B1) or in the carbon (B2) of Section ii-b. Instead, to keep the continuity with Section ii-a, which was already typed and numbered as pp. 1–3, the eleven new pages of Section ii-b were *hand*-numbered as pp. 4–9.[35]

Section iii: Towards the end of Heidegger's visit – and still before Heidegger had completed Section i – Husserl finished Section iii and had Langrebe type it up, this time with *two* carbon copies (B2 and B3). The reason for the extra carbon copy was that Heidegger would soon be leaving Freiburg, and not having had time to read and annotate Section iii in Freiburg, he would take B3 with him to Messkirch and work on it there. But again, since Section i was not yet finished and typed, Langrebe did not type page numbers in Section iii but instead hand-numbered them as pp. 10–17 to keep continuity with the other

[35] The hand-numbering is preserved only in B2. Section ii-b is missing from what remains of B1, and, on our hypothesis, no second carbon (B3) was ever typed up for Sections ii-a and ii-b, only for Sections i and iii, which were typed after Sections ii-a and ii-b.

two typed Sections.[36]

Section i: Finally Heidegger produced his draft of Section i – the Introduction to the Article, plus Part I on phenomenological psychology – and Landgrebe typed it into eleven double-spaced pages (=B1), but with only *one* carbon (B2). The reason why Husserl had Landgrebe type only a single carbon is that Heidegger would not be taking this Section with him to Messkirch and therefore Husserl would have the two copies he always required – the typed original and the single carbon – at his disposal in Freiburg. Heidegger annotated this typescript (B1) of Section i, but only minimally (especially pp. 5–7 and 9–10), before returning it to Landgrebe to be collated with the other Sections.

The final page-numbering of Draft B: Now that the length of Heidegger's Section i was known to be eleven pages, Landgrebe could systematize the page numbers of the entire draft as follows:

Section i: (B1, B2)	The page numbers were already typed as 1–11.
Section ii-a: (B1, B2)	The already typed page numbers, 1–3, were crossed out and replaced by handwritten page numbers 12, 13, 14.[37]
Section ii-b: (B1, B2)	The already *hand*written pages numbers, 4–9, were replaced (without being crossed out) by *typed* page numbers 15–20.
Section iii: (B1, B2, B3)	When the above had been done, page numbers 21–28 were typed onto the pages of this final Section.

Heidegger's work on Section iii (October 20–22): Heidegger left Freiburg for Messkirch by train on Thursday, October 20, taking with him the second carbon (B2) of Section iii – pp. 21–28 of the collated new draft – and leaving the rest with Husserl. He also took the three manuscripts of the "Studien zur Struktur des Bewußtseins" to reread over the next few days. While Husserl, in Freiburg, was for the first time reading and marking up Heidegger's newly typed Section i (Husserl worked only on the typed original, B1), Heidegger, in

[36] As with Section ii-b, this hand-numbering is preserved only in B2.

[37] The crossing out and renumbering is done in B1, the copy Husserl was going to work on. In B2 (the clean copy) the renumbering begins with p. 4, which becomes type-numbered p. 15.

Messkirch, was finding much to comment on and to question in Husserl's Section iii.

The main issue for Heidegger was the status of the transcendental ego in relation to the pure psychological ego. He wondered whether something like world-as-such was not an essential correlative of the absolute ego and, if so, whether Husserl's transcendental reduction could bracket out every actual and possible world.[38] He challenged Husserl's claim that the transcendentally reduced ego could not be the human ego *stricte dicta*.[39] And he argued that the "transcendental reduction" – the way one gets access to the self of transcendental constitution – was in fact a concrete and "immanent" possibility of "factical Dasein," analogous to the way that, in *Being and Time*, resoluteness is an existentiell possibility whereby concrete, worldly human beings appropriate their existential structure.[40]

When it came to writing up the outcome of his reading, Heidegger sought (1) to summarize what he thought were the most important questions still outstanding in Section iii, (2) to characterize how *Being and Time* frames the issue of the transcendental, and (3) to make general suggestions about reorganizing Section iii more concisely around the essential issues. All three topics flow together into the three pages that make up the first two appendices of his October 22 letter.[41]

For Husserl the transcendental constitution of worldly entities is the proper purview of the transcendental ego as "absolute," that is, precisely as *not* a worldly entity. This entails that transcendental constitution is emphatically not the work of the pure psychological ego *qua* psychological, for the latter is still a "positive" entity, straightforwardly posited in – and naïvely presuming the existence and validity of – the present-at-hand natural world. For Heidegger, on the other hand, the transcendental constitution of the being and significance of all "positive" present-at-hand entities is carried out by yet another entity "posited" in the world (indeed, "thrown" there), the concrete human being as factical Dasein. Although Dasein is through-and-through worldly, its very being, far from having the form of worldly entities' presence-at-hand, has the radically unique form of eksistence (*Existenz*), whose "wondersome" privilege it is to be the locus of transcendental constitution. In language that Heidegger uses in *Being and Time* but not here: Dasein is at once ontic (although not present-at-hand) and ontologico-transcendental.

On Saturday, October 22, having made his case as succinctly and pointedly as was feasible, Heidegger packed it all together – (1) the seven marked-up

---

[38] Heidegger's marginal note at B3 p. 24.22 = *Hu* IX, p. 274.6.

[39] Marginal note at B3 p. 25.21 = *Hu* IX, p. 275, n.

[40] B3 p. 25, note at the top margin, = *Hu* IX, p. 275, n.

[41] In the seven pages (21–28) of B3, Section iii, Heidegger marks in red those marginal notes of his to which he returns in Anlage I and Anlage II (the two appendices) of his letter.

pages of B3, Section iii, (2) the eight pages of his cover letter and its appendices, and (3) the copy of the "Studien zur Struktur des Bewußtseins" that he had taken from Freiburg – and mailed it all off to Husserl.

From Draft B to Draft C
(Late October 1927)

The dialogue of the deaf: Husserl received Heidegger's packet from Messkirch on or soon after Monday, October 23, and on the returned copy of B3, Section iii, he wrote: "Duplicate copy. The new text [that was prepared] for Heidegger, 21–28, with Heidegger's critical notes."[42] He read Heidegger's cover letter and copied out Appendices I and II in shorthand. In the process, he analytically divided each Appendix into seven sections by simply numbering each sentence or related groups of sentences.[43]

Appendix I was the core of Heidegger's letter. It summarized the argument he had been making during October 10–20, that the locus of the transcendental constitution of everything "positive" is the eksistence-structure of factical Dasein, which is never present-at-hand. Having studied Heidegger's argument Husserl sketched out a page of reflections on the issues it raised. This shorthand text, perhaps more than any other in their exchange, reveals Husserl's inability to see Heidegger's point.

> Human beings in the world – belonging to it, each one present-at-hand for the other, the way things are present-at-hand for everyone. But to have these presences-at-hand [*Vorhandenheiten*], there must be I-subjects who have consciousness of the presences-at-hand, who have an idea of them, knowledge [of them]; [these I-subjects] must have a desiring and willing "consciousness" and must relate themselves, as conscious subjects, in various ways – striving, valuing, acting – to what they are conscious of; must also relate to other people as human beings, as presences-at-hand or realities that are not just here or there and do not simply have real properties of whatever kind, but which, instead, are conscious subjects, etc., as was just mentioned.
>
> However, these various properties are properties of realities in the world. And so too are my properties, I who am a man and come upon myself as precisely that.
>
> Ontology as science of the world and of a possible world in general. The

---

[42] See *Hu* IX, p. 603.

[43] Husserl's shorthand transcriptions of Appendix I and Appendix II are catalogued in the Husserl-Archives as M III 10 III 3 (B3), respectively pp. 7a–7b and p. 9. For a transcription of Appendix I (p. 7a, b) see Heidegger's letter of October 22, 1927, below.

being-structure of the world. Universal structures of the world – of presences-at-hand. – The being-structure of subjects and of non-subjects.[44]

What Draft B accomplished: Although Husserl and Heidegger did not manage to agree on very much of substance during their working visit, the draft they produced together nevertheless did accomplish a great deal towards establishing the outline that the EB Article would follow all the way to its final form:

(1) Draft B determined that in the remaining drafts (although not in the final English version) the Article would unfold in *three Parts* rather than in the two Parts that had structured Draft A:

GENERAL OUTLINE OF DRAFT B
I. Phenomenological psychology A. *ad intra*: eidetic science of the pure psyche B. *ad extra*: foundation for empirical psychology
II. Psychological and transcendental phenomenology: A. their difference B. their relation (the one as propaedeutic to the other)
III. Transcendental phenomenology as universal science (from Draft A): A. *ad extra*: as grounding both apriori and factual sciences B. *ad intra*: as first philosophy, resolving all problems

(2) Draft B also gave *Part I* of the Article the articulation that, in general terms, would perdure through the final draft: phenomenological psychology both in itself (its object and method) and vis-à-vis pure psychology (its function as grounding). Husserl would add to this section and rewrite it, but at the end of the entire process of writing the Article he could tell Heidegger that in Draft D, as regards Part I, "something essential [of Heidegger's suggestions] was retained."[45]

(3) Draft B likewise determined the pattern that *Part II* of the Article would follow through the final draft. Draft B focused Part II on five distinct topics, which here emerged clearly for the first time. The first of those five topics finally gathered into one place the treatment of the pre-history of phenomenology that in Draft A had been awkwardly divided between Part I, §6 and Part II, §1. More importantly, the center of Part II became the section on the transcen-

[44] *Hu* IX, p. 603 (=M III 10, III 3 [in B3]), numbered as p. 8 in the Husserl-Archives cataloguing of the manuscript.

[45] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 149.

dental reduction, which finally received the thorough treatment it deserved. The following chart indicates the five topics of Draft B, Part II, and where those topics would finally be located in Draft D of the Article:

OUTLINE OF DRAFT B, PART TWO	
Part II: Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology:	
A. their difference	
the historical inability to distinguish the two (Locke)	(=D §6)
the necessity of distinguishing the two (the transcendental problem)	(=D §7)
the failure to distinguish the two (psychologism)	(=D §8)
the proper way to distinguish the two (transcendental reduction)	(=D §9)
B. their relation	
the positive outcome of distinguishing the two (propaedeutic)	(=D §10)

(4) Finally, on the negative side, Draft B produced an introduction that would not make it beyond the next draft. Heidegger's attempt to locate the enterprise of phenomenology centrally within philosophy's perennial and unsolved problem about the meaning of being did make its way (slightly changed) into Husserl's transitional Draft C, but it was dropped entirely from Draft D in favor of Husserl's rewriting of the brief one-paragraph introduction that had opened Draft A.

Now that Heidegger had withdrawn from the project, and the dust had settled, Drafts C and D could evolve. How did that take place?

Draft C
(October 23–?, 1927)

The dating of Draft C: Husserl produced much if not all of the penultimate Draft C in the week between October 23 and 31. The *terminus a quo* of these dates is calculated from Husserl's receipt of Heidegger's mailing from Freiburg, and the *terminus ad quem* is deduced from certain remarks of Husserl's Polish colleague Roman Ingarden, who, before departing Freiburg at the end of October, read Draft C at Husserl's home. Ingarden, then thirty-four years old, had received a six-month research grant, two months of which (September 1 to October 31) he spent in Freiburg. But because Husserl was on vacation in Switzerland and did not return to Freiburg until September 15,

Ingarden, as he notes in a memoir, "had only six weeks to talk with Husserl."[46] He writes:

> At the time, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article was causing Husserl a great deal of concern. He took the whole business with extraordinary seriousness and wrote a number of drafts. I got the third or fourth version, and Husserl asked me to make critical remarks. I would have shaped such an article in a completely different way than Husserl did. I would have given a reasonably concise but thorough report on the already existing phenomenological researches of Husserl and his co-workers. But Husserl set himself the task of an entirely systematic reflection that lays out the idea of phenomenology by starting from phenomenological psychology. That was what he wanted to do, and I thought it was none of my business to raise objections. [....] We spent two mornings discussing these details, and Husserl was visibly pleased that I really got into the work. He even wrote notes from our discussion directly into his text. But as far as I knew, work on the Article continued for a good deal more time.[47]

Ingarden says he read and discussed "the third or fourth version" ("die dritte oder vierte Redaktion") of the EB Article, but it was certainly the third. Draft C was a transitional text between the one that was worked out during Heidegger's visit and the final version that Husserl would send off to England to be translated. At fifty-two full pages, it was the longest of the four versions, and Husserl referred to it as "the large draft" (die größere Fassung).[48] The final draft, D, is basically a compression of C,[49] with some pages taken over entirely and others rewritten in shorter form. It is highly unlikely that Husserl composed *two* drafts by October 31: the 52–page Draft C *and* the twenty-one new pages that make up Draft D. Thus we conclude that Ingarden read Draft C.

The title of Draft C: The Article as commissioned by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* was to be entitled simply "Phenomenology." Husserl himself had said as much in his first reference to the work, on September 30, 1927.[50] But with Draft C Husserl for the first and last time gives the Article a descriptive

---

[46] Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, "Besuch bei Husserl im Herbst 1927," pp. 152–3. Ingarden mistakenly says Husserl vacationed in the Black Forest: p. 152.

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 153. Ingarden continues (pp. 153–4): "Quietly within myself I found it unfortunate that Husserl was spending so much time on the Article. I was convinced that the Article was much too long and that he would have to cut it back it substantially. I also feared that when it came to shortening it and putting it into English, an editor-translator would be chosen who was not up to the matter and that to some degree he might be without resources, since English is not suited to Husserl's subtle conceptual formations (and basically remains so even today)."

[48] In shorthand in the top margin of Draft D2, p. 1; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 591–2.

[49] The transitional nature of C with regard to D can be seen in the descriptive rubric that Husserl wrote on the outer cover of the first carbon, C2: "Final draft [sic!] – Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Phenomenology – *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Last elaboration [sic!]." ("Endfassung – phänomenologische Psychologie und transzendentale Phänomenologie – Encyclopaedia Britannica. Letzte Ausarbeitung"): *Hu* IX, p. 591 with p. 605.

[50] *Briefwechsel* IX, p. 306. See above.

working title: "Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Philosophy."[51] This title disappears in future drafts of the Article but is carried over into the Amsterdam Lectures. Those two lectures, which Husserl described as a "reworking of the typed draft [written] for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*,"[52] are entitled, respectively, "Phenomenological Psychology" and "Transcendental Phenomenology."[53]

The Introduction to Draft C: Draft C represents a provisional effort by Husserl to utilize some of the suggestions Heidegger had made. In Draft B Heidegger's "Introduction," entitled "The Idea of Philosophy, and the Step Back to Consciousness," (B1 and B2, pp. 1.1–3.10), attempted to locate the entire project of phenomenology within the traditional problematic of the being of entities. Surprisingly enough, Husserl lifted those three pages out of B and brought them over, with relatively minor changes, into Draft C, where they serve as its "Introduction" (pp. 1, a,b,c,d). We do observe, however, that even as he appropriated Heidegger's Introduction, Husserl toned down the emphasis on the question of being. For example, whereas Heidegger in B asserted that "the guiding philosophical problematic" was "the question of the being of entities" and only in the name of that was the turn to consciousness called for,[54] Husserl in C claims only that the "fundamental relatedness of all entities to consciousness *somehow* captures the ontological sense of those entities."[55] And in fact in Draft D Husserl dropped this Introduction entirely.

Draft D
(November, 1927)

The dating of Draft D: Husserl reduced the fifty-two typed pages of Draft C to the thirty-five pages of Draft D sometime between November 1 and December 1, 1927. The *terminus a quo* of these dates is calculated from Roman Ingarden's departure from Freiburg on October 31 after he had read (perhaps only some of) Draft C. The *terminus ad quem* is calculated from a letter that Husserl addressed to Heidegger on December 8, 1927:

---

[51] Husserl writes at the top of C2 (carbon copy): "...phänomenologische Psychologie und transzendentale Philosophie...." *Hu* IX, p. 591; cf. p. 605.

[52] *Hu* IX, p. 615; cf. pp. 617 and 621.

[53] But in a letter to Roman Ingarden (January 1, 1929) Husserl referred to the two Lectures by the titles (1) "Phänom[enologie] u[nd] Psychologie" and (2) "Transzend[entale] Phänom[enologie]": *Briefwechsel* III, p. 245.

[54] B, p. 2.2–9, partially omitted by Biemel at *Hu* IX, p. 256.24–31.

[55] C 1b = *Hu* IX, p. 517.39–40, emphasis added.

Freiburg 8.XII.27

Dear friend,

[....] Many thanks for your lovely letter.[56] Why did I not answer [your letter of October 22], why did I not write at all? Naturally because of a lack of inner calm. The new version of the London Article, now very carefully thought out and arranged,[57] turned out nicely, although quite differently from the way you would like to have it, even though something essential [of your suggestions] was retained. In the end it was – and I left it – altogether too long, but I did not want to have to do anything more with it, and it just could not be shortened any further. So I sent if off to England and still have no answer. An expanded version, which takes into consideration a topic that went untreated – the double meaning of psychology: as naturalistic and as humanistically oriented (my old antithesis) – should go into the *Jahrbuch* as an introduction to further publications.

Very cordial greetings from our family to yours,

Your faithful friend,

EH[58]

I argue that Draft D was finished and sent off to England on or before December 1. My reasons are as follows: (1) I take it that the above letter is saying that Husserl had not answered Heidegger's letter of October 22 until "today," December 8, because throughout November Husserl had been too preoccupied ("weil es an innerer Ruhe fehlte") with finishing Draft D by the deadline. (2) And insofar as Husserl says that "today," eight days into December, he "*still*" has had no answer from England (or equally "has had no answer *yet*"), we might calculate that he mailed off Draft D *at the very least* one week before December 8, that is, on or before December 1.

The writing of Draft D: The fourth draft is, in the main, a condensation of the third draft, with some significant omissions and changes.[59] (1) The Introduction to Draft D represents Husserl's abandonment of Heidegger's contextualization of the Article in terms of the question of being. Instead, Husserl reverts to Draft A's Introduction, which he rewrites and expands. (2) Husserl takes over one-third of Draft C (eleven pages) and inserts them whole into Draft D (see accompanying chart). The remaining two-thirds of Draft D is comprised of twenty-one newly typed pages, which are often quite close to the material of Draft C. (3) The major condensation takes place in Part III, where Draft D reduces the fifteen pages of C by more than half, to the six-and-a-half pages of D.

---

[56] Presumably not the letter of October 22 but one that arrived close to December 8, inquiring why Husserl had not answered that of October 22.

[57] A reference, perhaps, to Heidegger's suggestions, in Appendix II of his October 22 letter, about the arrangement of Part II of the Article.

[58] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 149.

[59] In the following chart arrows indicate pages that are taken over whole (without retyping) from Draft C and inserted into Draft D. The other pages of Draft D were newly typed.

It should be noted that on p. 1 of the typed original, D1, Husserl wrote in shorthand: "A draft of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article. The brackets are merely indications for the proposed abridgments, so as to stay within the restricted length of the English version (Salmon)." However, I have not found any significant bracketings of large sections of material in D1.[60]

[60] "Ein Entwurf zum Artikel der Encyclopaedia Britannica, die Einklammerungen sind bloß Anzeigen für Verkürzungen, vorgeschlagen um den vorgeschriebenen engen Raum des englischen Artikels (Salmon) innehalten zu können." *Hu* IX, 592 and 605.

TRANSITION FROM: DRAFT C	TO DRAFT D		
INTRODUCTION			
1 a b c d	1a (returns to, and rewrites, A1)		
PART I **PURE PSYCHOLOGY: ITS FIELD OF EXPERIENCE, ITS METHOD, AND FUNCTION**			
1	1b	§1	278.8
2	2	§2	279.6
3 →	3		
4 →	4		
5	5		
6	6	§3	281.24
7			
8	7		
8a			
9	8		
10	9	§4	284.4
11			
12	10	§5	285.3
13	11		
13a →	11a		
13b →	11b		
PART II **PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY**			
14	12	§6	287.2
15			
16	13	§7	288.14
17			
18			
19 →	16	§8	290.11
20	17		
21 →	18		
22	19	§9	292.10
23	20		
24	21		
25			
26 →	22		
27 →	23		
28	24	§10	295.7
29			
30	25		
PART III **TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY AS UNIVERSAL SCIENCE WITH ABSOLUTE FOUNDATIONS**			
31 to 43 top half: Cut entirely.[61]	26	§11	296.22
		§12	297.16
	27	§13	298.1
	28	§14	298.25
		§15	299.3
43 bottom half →	29		
44 →	29b	§16	299.33
45 top half →	30		
bottom half →	31		

[61] These pages are translated below, Draft C, "From the Later Pages of the Third Draft."

DRAFT D
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PART I:
PURE PSYCHOLOGY:
ITS FIELD OF EXPERIENCE, ITS METHOD, AND ITS FUNCTION

§1 Pure natural science and pure psychology
§2 The purely psychical in self-experience and community experience.
The universal description of intentional experiences.
§3 The self-contained field of the purely psychical.
– Phenomenological reduction and true inner experience.
§4 Eidetic reduction and phenomenological psychology as an eidetic science.
§5 The fundamental function of pure phenomenological psychology
for an exact empirical psychology.

PART II
PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY

§6 Descartes' transcendental turn and Locke's psychologism.
§7 The transcendental problem.
§8 Psychologism's solution as a transcendental circle.
§9 The transcendental-phenomenological reduction
and the semblance of transcendental doubling.
§10 Pure psychology as a propaedeutic to transcendental phenomenology.

PART III
TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY AS UNIVERSAL SCIENCE WITH ABSOLUTE FOUNDATIONS

§11 Transcendental phenomenology as ontology.
§12 Phenomenology and the crisis in the foundations of the exact sciences.
§13 The phenomenological grounding of the factual sciences
in relation to empirical phenomenology.
§14 Complete phenomenology as all-embracing philosophy.
§15 The "ultimate and highest" problems as phenomenological.
§16 The phenomenological resolution of all philosophical antitheses.

Draft E
(December 1, 1927 to February [March?] 1928)

Draft E is the name we give to the two English versions of Draft D that Christopher V. Salmon prepared in Oxford, England, between December 1, 1927 and the end of February, 1928. In many passages Draft E represents a paraphrase rather than a translation of Draft D; in fact, it is the paraphrase of a severely condensed, and in some sections significantly rearranged, Draft D. As we argued above, Husserl sent Salmon Draft D on or about December 1, 1927.

Christopher V. Salmon. Having received his M.A. in philosophy at Oxford, Christopher Verney Salmon studied with Husserl in Freiburg during the winter semester of 1922 and again during 1926–1927.[62] In the summer of 1927 Salmon defended the doctoral dissertation that he had written under Husserl's direction, "The Central Problem of Hume's Philosophy: A Phenomenological Interpretation of the First Book of the *Treatise on Human Nature*."[63] The work was published a year later in Husserl's *Jahrbuch*, and Husserl refers to that forthcoming publication in his Bibliography to Draft A of the Article.[64] A year after translating the EB Article, Salmon was appointed a lecturer at the University of Belfast, and he continued to present Husserl's philosophy to the English-speaking public. On December 2, 1929 he delivered a lecture to the Aristotelian Society in London, "The Starting-Point of Husserl's Philosophy."[65] Soon after that he helped W.R. Boyce Gibson read the page proofs of Boyce Gibson's translation of Husserl's *Ideas*,[66] and in 1932, a year after the work came out in English, Salmon published a review of it.[67] However, contact between Salmon and Husserl fell off after that, and in the spring of 1937 Husserl noted that Professor Salmon had not written to him over the last

---

[62] See, respectively: *Briefwechsel* III, p. 44 (December 13, 1922, to Winthrop Pickard Bell) and VI, p. 136 (October 23, 1929, to W.R. Boyce Gibson). On Husserl's estimation of him as *hochbegabter Engländer*, see W.R. Boyce Gibson, "From Husserl to Heidegger: Excerpts from a 1928 Freiburg Diary," ed. Herbert Spiegelberg, *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 2 (1971), 58–83: p. 63; see also pp. 66 and 71.

[63] Husserl's evaluation of the work is found in *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 469–470 (July 12, 1927: Gutachten über Salmons Dissertation).

[64] *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* X (1929), 299–449; incorrectly cited as "X (1928)" in *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 469, n. 1. The work was likewise published in Halle by Niemeyer in the same year. (For the correct date, see Schuhmann, "Husserl's Yearbook," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 50, Supplement, Fall 1990, p. 20.) The Bibliography to Draft A refers to the forthcoming work simply as: "Chr. Salmon, *Hume's Philosophy* (in English)."

[65] Published under that title in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, new series, 30 (1930), 55–78. Husserl mentions the lecture in *Briefwechsel* VI, p. 137 (October 28, 1929, to Gibson).

[66] *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 136–140 (1929–30, various letters to Boyce Gibson), and Boyce Gibson's glowing remarks in the "Translator's Preface" to Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1931 (reprinted: New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 24.

[67] *Mind*, 41 (1932), 226–236. See *Briefwechsel* VII, p. 66 (May 12, 1932) and p. 70 (April 3, 1933) Both of these are letters from Ernest Wood Edwards to Husserl.

years.[68] Salmon published a brief article in French on Husserl in 1947.[69] He died in 1960.

A chronology of Draft E: The evolution of Draft E appears to be as follows:

(1) Since Salmon had already agreed to translate the EB Article into English, Husserl sent him Draft D by December 1, 1927. (Salmon was then residing at 14 St. Giles St., Oxford, England.[70]) To save retyping the bibliography that had been prepared for Draft A, Husserl appended to Draft D the last two pages of Draft A2 (pp. 24 and 25) – that is, the bibliography plus the last seven lines of text of that first draft.

(2) In the three months between early December 1927 and the end of February 1928 Salmon produced two quite similar – but chronologically distinct – versions of Draft E, which we call E1 and E2. Each of these two versions had a typed original (which we call "a") and a carbon copy ("b"). The Husserl-Archives preserves, under the signature M III 10, the carbon copy of E1 (= E1b), which is catalogued as "II 2" and the typed original of E2 (= E2a), which is catalogued as "II 1."[71] Those texts came about as follows:

(3) In December and/or January Salmon produced E1, both in a typed original (E1a) and a carbon copy (E1b). He retained the typed original in Oxford (it is now lost) and mailed the carbon, E1b, to Husserl in Freiburg.[72]

(4) By the end of February 1928 – without having heard back from Husserl – Salmon typed up the second and final version, E2, which simply incorporated the minor corrections already made in E1 and which changed nothing else. Salmon then inscribed the title page of the typed original (E2a) with the dedication:

> Herrn Geheimrat Edmund Husserl
> with Affection and all Respect
> from
> Christopher V. Salmon.
> Feb. 1928.

---

[68] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 372 (May 5, 1937, to Landgrebe).

[69] "La phénoménologie après Husserl," in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 31 (1947), 237–240.

[70] *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 152 (March 5, 1928, to Heidegger).

[71] Hence: M III 10 II, 2 and II, 1. Herbert Spiegelberg's comment that "All that can now be found in the Husserl-Archives is the dedicated personal copy of Salmon's typescript without reading marks" ("On the Misfortunes of Edmund Husserl's Article," pp. 19f.) has proven not to be correct. Spiegelberg is referring to E2a (M III 10 II 1). However, both E1b and E2a can be found in the Husserl-Archives, Leuven.

[72] Salmon himself had written in some corrections, by hand, in the carbon copy. In E1b, for example, Salmon adds "Par." ("Paragraph"), plus a number, at each title of the sub-divisions; he also corrects a typographical error ("International" for "Intentional" in the title of §1), etc. The title of §2 is corrected (perhaps by a hand other than Salmon's?) from "...Psychical Psychological..." to "...Phenomenological Psychological...," and so forth.

(5) On Wednesday, February 29, 1928, Husserl and Heidegger met in Freiburg as each one was going his separate way to vacations in the Black Forest: Heidegger to Todtnauberg, Husserl to Breitnau.[73] It was at this meeting that Husserl consigned to Heidegger the manuscript of the lectures on internal time-consciousness, which Heidegger had agreed to edit. By accident, however, Husserl had left inside the folder of the manuscript some four pages from E1b. Husserl had already corrected these pages but had failed to send them back to Salmon. Therefore, on March 5, 1928, Husserl sent a letter to Heidegger in Todtnauberg:

> Dear friend,
>
> In the folder with the time manuscript (which I originally had wanted to take with me to Breitnau) there are some pages from the English version of my Encyclopaedia Article: Salmon's typewritten pages, to which I added corrections. Would you please send these pages, as my corrections, *directly* to Chr. V. Salmon, Oxford, 14 St. Giles, with a simple note saying they are from me. I am also writing to him directly.[74]

(6) The (four) pages that Husserl was referring to, and that Heidegger did indeed sent on to Salmon, were pp. 14–16 and p. 20; they are missing from E1b.[75] We are faced, then, with the anomaly of Husserl sending off corrections of E1 in early March 1928 *after* Salmon had already typed up and dedicated E2 in late February. Moreover, there is no manuscript evidence that the pages of E2 that correspond to the missing pages of E1 were changed by Salmon in any significant way.[76] It seems, then, that Husserl's effort to amend some pages of Draft E failed. Salmon sent off E2b to the editorial offices of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in London (and E2a to Husserl in Freiburg) without benefit of Husserl's suggestions.

---

[73] See Husserl/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel* p. 90–1 (February 25 and March 6, 1928, Heidegger to Jaspers). On February 25 Heidegger had received the official "call" to be Husserl's successor in the chair of philosophy at Freiburg, effective October 1 of that year, and of course he and Husserl would have discussed that during their visit in Freiburg.

[74] The letter continues: "I got a sore throat in Breitnau, with a cold, etc., so despite the wonderful weather I had to come home on Sunday [March 4] already. Fortunately it is not a flu, but I still have to stay in bed about two more days and gulp down aspirin. / Best wishes. Surely you are enjoying the lovely weather. Are you able to ski [in Todtnauberg]? All the best to your wife, / Yours, / EH." *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 152–153.

[75] Pages 14–16 correspond to material from §9 of Draft D, while p. 20 corresponds to material from §15.

[76] While it is true that the first five lines of p. 13 of E2 do not follow from p. 12 (indicating that p. 12 was retyped), they are not changed at all from the last five lines of p. 12. I take it that this indicates Salmon did not appropriate any suggestions from Husserl at this point.

From Draft E to Draft F (March 1928–September 1929)

The structure of Drafts E and F: One should not conflate Draft E, and specifically E2, with the version that was finally published in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1929. E2 is the twenty-five-page typescript that Salmon submitted to the London offices of the *Britannica* around March of 1928. Itself a radical condensation of Husserl's Draft D, Draft E2 was further cut back by the editors of the *Britannica* – two full pages were omitted – before getting into print. We call the published version Draft F.[77]

In the broadest terms, Draft E represents a reversion to the outline of Draft A. Whereas Draft D (explicitly) and Drafts B and C (implicitly) were divided into three Parts, E reverts to the two-part outline of A – that is, it gathers the topics of Draft D's Part III ("Transcendental Phenomenology and Philosophy as Universal Science with Absolute Foundations") under Draft E's Part II ("Transcendental Phenomenology"). Moreover, Draft E radically reduces the sixteen divisions of Draft D to only four, and Draft F further reduces even these.

The lifespan of Draft F: 1929–1956. By September of 1929 it was over: the 4000–word Draft F of the Article was published in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* over the signature "E. Hu."[78] Although this fourteenth edition stayed in print (with various up-dates and revisions) until 1974, Husserl's entry "Phenomenology" survived only until 1956, when it was replaced by another article with the same title, written by John N. Findlay. After it went out of print with the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1956, Husserl's Draft F was republished with one important orthographical correction – and one glaring mistake – in Roderick M. Chisholm's collection, *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology.*[79] In 1966 Findlay's text was replaced by one written by Herbert Spiegelberg. Beginning with the fifteenth edition of the *Britannica* (1974), the article "Phenomenology" was embedded within the larger entry "Philosophical Schools and Doctrines," and Spiegel-

---

[77] Besides omitting the two pages, the editors also made some orthographical changes in the text. Whereas Salmon tends to capitalize a number of words – for example: Reflection, Phenomena, Intentional, Perception, Imagined, Remembered, Copied – the editors put such terms in lower case. The editors, however, repeated Salmon's erroneous accents on two Greek words: Salmon's εἶδος instead of εἶδος, and his νόεω instead of νοέω.

[78] *The Encyclopaedia Britannica: A New Survey of Universal Knowledge*, 14th edition London and New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1929, vol. 17 ("P to Planting of Trees"), pp. 699–702. The identification of the author is given in that same volume on p. viii: "Edmund Husserl. Professor of Philosophy, University of Freiberg [sic]."

[79] Roderick M. Chisholm, ed., *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*, New York and Glencoe: Free Press, 1960, pp. 118–128. The orthographical correction: from Salmon's erroneous "phenomenalists" to the correct translation "phenomenologists" in the last sentence. The glaring mistake: the translator was identified (in this, the year he died) as "Christopher V. Solomon."

DIVISIONS AND SUB-DIVISIONS IN	
DRAFT E (Salmon's typescript)	**DRAFT F (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*)**
Introduction (untitled)	Introduction (untitled)
PART I PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY	PART I PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY
§1 Natural Science and Psychology, Intentional Experience	
§2 The closed Field of the Phenomenological–Psychological and Eidetic Reductions	Phenomenological–Psychological and Eidetic Reductions
PART II TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY	PART II TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY
§3 Locke and Descartes, and the Problems of Transcendental Philosophy	
§4 Phenomenology, the Universal Science	Phenomenology, the Universal Science
REFERENCE	BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the following chart the boxed and shaded material indicates the sections of Draft D that are (severely) condensed under the various titles of Draft E.

DRAFT E in relation to DRAFT D

Introduction
(untitled)

PART I
PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY

§1. Natural Science and Psychology, Intentional Experience

Part I:
§1 Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology
§2 The Purely Psychical in Self-experience and Community Experience. The Universal Description of Intentional Experiences.

§2. The Closed Field of the Phenomenological–Psychological and Eidetic Reductions

§3 The Self-contained Field of the Purely Psychical. – Phenomenological Reduction and True Inner Experience.
§4 Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as an Eidetic Science
§5 The Fundamental Function of Pure Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Science

PART II
TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY

§3. Locke and Descartes, and the Problems of Transcendental Philosophy

Part II:
§6 Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Locke's Psychologism
§10 Pure Psychology as Propaedeutic to Transcendental Phenomenology
§8 Psychologism's solution as a Transcendental Circle
§7 The Transcendental Problem
} mixed together
§9 The Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction and the Semblance of Transcendental Doubling

§4. Phenomenology, the Universal Science

Part III:
§11 Transcendental Phenomenology as Ontology
§12 Phenomenology and the Crisis of Foundations in the Exact Sciences
§14 Complete Phenomenology as All-embracing Philosophy
§13 The Phenomenological Grounding of the Factual Sciences, and Empirical Phenomenology
§15 The "Ultimate and Highest" Problems as Phenomenological
§16 The Phenomenological Resolution of All Philosophical Antitheses

BIBLIOGRAPHY

berg's text, in a curious editorial amalgamation, got rearranged and merged with a text written by Walter Biemel. In 1986 the Spiegelberg-Biemel article was dropped in favor of a short summary-article on phenomenology written by *Britannica* staffers.[80]

[80] The fifteenth edition was the one newly designed by Mortimer Adler and others (Micropaedia, Macropaedia, Propaedia). I am grateful to Mr. Sherman Hollar of the *Britannica* offices in Chicago for the information in this paragraph on the editorial history of the article.

APPENDIX:
THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE EB ARTICLE

Thomas Sheehan

The cataloguing of Husserl's manuscripts in general

Husserl's manuscripts are preserved in the Husserl-Archives, Leuven, and are catalogued in Groups that are designated by capitalized letters of the alphabet. These, in turn, are divided into Sub-groups that are designated by capitalized Roman numerals. The Groups fall into two sets:

(1) Groups A–F were organized in Freiburg, in March 1935, by Ludwig Landgrebe and Eugen Fink working under Husserl's direction. Group B, for example, contains manuscripts pertaining to the reduction, which are further divided into such Sub-groups as: I. "Ways to the Reduction," II. "The Reduction itself and its Methodology," and so on. Group F contains the texts of Husserl's courses and his individual lectures (*Vorlesungen und Vorträge*). It is in this last group (specifically in Sub-group II) that the Amsterdam Lectures are found.

(2) The second set – Groups K to X – was organized after Husserl had died in 1938. This work was initiated by the first Director of the Husserl-Archives, Father Herman Leo Van Breda, and was carried out in Leuven/Louvain. The drafts of the EB Article fall into this second category, specifically in Group M.

The cataloguing of the manuscripts of the EB Article

Group M is divided into three Sub-groups. The third of these, M III, contains seventeen "Projects for Publication," each project being designated by an Arabic numeral. Number 10 of those projects is the EB Article. Hence, the lead-in signature that is common to *all* the drafts of the EB Article is "M III 10."

M I	courses (*Vorlesungen*)
M II	individual lectures (*Vorträge*)
M III	projects for publication (*Entwürfe für Publikationen*) Number 10: The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article

The general signature M III 10 is further subdivided (and subdivided again) in quite *unhelpful* ways, insofar as these further sub-divisions (a) do not correspond to the chronological development of the drafts of the Article, (b) do not accurately distinguish the various drafts, and (c) are inconsistent in making a distinction between the *different drafts* and the various *copies* (typed original, and carbon copies) within each draft.[1] In short, the current cataloguing of the manuscripts of the EB Article is quite misleading and arguably should be replaced by a more rational system.

The following two charts present (1) the current ordering of the manuscripts of the EB Article at the Husserl-Archives and (2) the presumed *chronological* order of those manuscripts. For the latter we provide both a brief and a detailed form.

[1] The cataloguing of Drafts A, B, and C (and especially B) at the Husserl-Archives leaves much to be desired. The drafts are all lumped together under the lead-in signature "M III 10 III," accompanied by Van Breda's uninformative rubric "Fragments for the preparation of the article 'Phenomenology' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Included: M. Heidegger's letter and notes on the article – 1927." ("Bruchstücke zur Vorbereitung des Artikels "Phenomenology" in En. Br. Dabei: Brief und Noten dazu von M. Heidegger – 1927.")

If one wanted to follow this cataloguing and gather all the preparatory drafts (A, B, C) under one heading, the three *copies* of Draft B (the typed original and the two carbons) should have been numbered separately so as to keep consistency with the copies in Drafts A and C. The current cataloguing makes no distinction between the copies of Draft B: (1) they are all lumped together as M III 10 III 3; and (2) the first two copies of Draft B are hand-numbered by the Husserl-Archives staff as if they constituted a single, consecutive text: the typed original is hand-numbered pp. 2–45; the first carbon copy is hand-numbered pp. 46–74 (as if it were a continuation of, not a copy of, the first forty-five pages).

THE *CATALOGUED* ORDER OF "M III 10" IN THE HUSSERL-ARCHIVES

I	1	carbon copy [D1]		pp.	1a, 1b, 10–11, 11a, 11b 12–29, 29b, 30–1	FOURTH DRAFT [D]
	2	carbon copy [D2]		pp.	1, 2, 5–15, 17, 24–29	
II	1	Salmon's second draft typed original [E2a]		pp.	1–22 + i–ii and 1–2	SALMON'S ABRIDGED TRANSLATION [E]
	2	Salmon's first draft carbon copy[4] [E1b]		pp.	1–13;17–9;21–2;i–ii and 1–2[2,3]	
III	1	second carbon: [A1]		pp.	1–23, plus 5a and 7a (p. 24–25 are found in E1b)	FIRST DRAFT [A]
	2	first carbon:[5] [A2]		pp.	1–24, plus 5a and 7a (p. 25 = missing)	
	3	typed original: [B1]	i	pp.	1–11	SECOND DRAFT [B]
			ii-a	pp.	12–14 <1–3>	
			–	–	– missing	
			iii	pp.	21–28	
		first carbon: [B2]	i	pp.	1–11	
			ii-a	pp.	12–14 <1–3>	
			ii-b	pp.	15–20 <4–9>	
			iii	pp.	21–28 <10–17>	
		second carbon: [B3]	–	–	– non-existent	
			–	–	– non-existent	
			–	–	– non-existent	
			iii	pp.	21–28	
	4	carbon copy: [C2]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1–13, plus 8a; 13a,b; 14–18, 20, 22–25, 28–42, 43 (second half), 44–45.	THIRD DRAFT [C]
	5	carbon copy: [C3]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1–13, plus 8a; 13a,b; 14–45	
	6	typed original [C1]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1–2,5–13, plus 8a; 15–18, 20, 22–25, 28–30, 43 (first half)	

[2] Pp. 24–25 of Draft A1 (i.e., the last lines of the German draft plus the two pages of bibliography) are attached to the end of this text.

[3] Here and in the following draft, p. i is the cover sheet, and p. ii is the introductory paragraph, whereas pp. 1–2 are the bibliography at the end. Concerning the missing pages, see *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 152 (March 5, 1928, Husserl to Heidegger).

[4] The original is lost.

[5] The original is lost.

THE DRAFTS OF THE EB ARTICLE IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER ARCHIVAL SIGNATURE: M III 10

		FIRST DRAFT ("A")
—	A0	original shorthand text by Husserl: lost
—	A00	typed copy of the original shorthand text: lost
III 2	A2	first carbon copy of the typed original: "Freiburg copy"
III 1	A1	second carbon copy of the typed original: "Todtnauberg copy"
		SECOND DRAFT ("B")
III 3	B1	typed original: working copy, incomplete.
	B2	first carbon copy, complete and clean. Sections i, ii-a, ii-b, iii.
	B3	second carbon copy, "Messkirch copy." Section iii only.
		THIRD DRAFT ("C")
III 6	C1	typed original: incomplete
III 4	C2	carbon copy; incomplete working copy
III 5	C3	carbon copy; only complete copy of Draft C
		FOURTH DRAFT ("D")
I 1	D1	complete fourth draft: typed original
I 2	D2	incomplete carbon copy of D1: second carbon
—	D3	complete carbon copy of D1, sent to Salmon: lost
		SALMON'S ABRIDGED TRANSLATION ("E")
—	E1a	First draft: typed original: lost
II 2	E1b	First draft: carbon copy (sent to Husserl)
II 1	E2a	Second draft, correction of E1: typed (sent to Husserl)
—	E2b	Copy of E2a, sent to *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: lost.
		PUBLISHED VERSION ("F")
—	F	Edited version of E2b, published

THE CHRONOLOGICAL *ORDER OF THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE EB ARTICLE LONGER FORM:*

FIRST DRAFT ("A") [III, 1 and 2]

Draft A0

Form: original Gabelsberg shorthand draft
Date: September 1–15, 1927 (Switzerland[6]) perhaps continuing after September 15, 1927 (Freiburg)
Status: lost

Draft A00

Form: original typed version of the shorthand draft
Date: typed after September 15, 1927
Status: lost
Pages: 27 pages: originally 25 pages; then pp. 5a and 7a were added.

Draft A2, The "Freiburg" copy [= III, 2]

Form: first carbon copy of a lost typed original of 27 pages.
Date: typed after September 15, 1927
Status: virtually complete carbon copy of the typed transcription of Husserl's original shorthand text; pp. 24–25 (the last two pages) are found in E1b.
Title: None.
Pages: 25 out of 27 pages: pp. 1–23, plus pp. 5a and 7a inserted. Husserl sent pages 24–25 (containing the last lines of the text, plus the - bibliography) to Salmon; they are found at the end of E1b (Salmon's first translation-draft).

Draft A1, The "Todtnauberg" copy [=III, 1]

Form: second carbon copy (same as III, 2, above) of a lost typed original.
Status: virtually complete carbon copy of the typed transcription of Husserl's original, shorthand text
Title: "First draft, [pp.] 1–21"[7]
Pages: 26 out of 27 pages: pp. 1–24, plus pp. 5a and 7a. Page 25 (the last page of the bibliography, what would be the twenty-seventh page of the complete draft) is missing.

---

[6] *Briefwechsel*, VIII, p. 39, n.2, correcting the information in Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, p. 152. Cf. also *Briefwechsel*, III, p. 456 (August 3, 1927, to Mahnke).

[7] This phrase – "Erster Entwurf 1–21" – appears in Husserl's shorthand on p. 1 of the text; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 592. However, the text has 26 pages (see immediately below). Could the last two lines of p. 21, where the paragraph begins with a hand-numbered "3" (=*Hu* IX, p. 252.38–39) have been a later addition to Husserl's "first draft"?

SECOND DRAFT ("B")
[III, 3]

Draft B1

Form: typed original (incomplete). Heidegger wrote the first 11 pages (Section i), Husserl the remaining 17 pages (Sections ii-a, ii-b, and iii.

Date: between September 15 and October 10, 1927 (section ii-a), between October 10 and 20, 1927 (Sections i, ii-b, and iii).

Status: incomplete typed version of Husserl's and Heidegger's attempt to compose a second draft: Section ii-b is missing. Many editorial marks.

Title: None.

Pages: 24 pages: (1) In the editing process pp. 15–20 were removed, leaving 22 out of the original 28 pages; and then (2) two pages were inserted from elsewhere.[8]

Draft B2

Form: first carbon copy of typed original, in four sections as above.

Status: complete (and clean) carbon copy of Husserl's and Heidegger's attempt to compose a second draft.

Title: "Encyclopaedia Britannica. The attempt at a second draft (during Heidegger's stay), pp. 15–28, plus Heidegger's pp. 1–10."[9]

Pages: 28 out of 28 pages.

Draft B3, the "Messkirch" copy

Form: second carbon copy, incomplete.

Date: typed shortly before October 20, 1927.

Status: severely incomplete: contains only Section iii.

Title: "Duplicate copy. The new text [that was prepared] for Heidegger [pp.] 21–28 with Heidegger's critical notes."[10]

Pages: Only pp. 21–28.

Other: Included is Heidegger's handwritten letter to Husserl, dated October 22, 1927, along with its three appendices.

---

[8] Re the two inserted pages: (1) After p. 14 of this draft Husserl has inserted p. 14 of Draft C1. (2) Next to p. 21 of the present draft Husserl has placed the bottom half of p. 21 (i.e., lines 19–28) of Draft B3.

[9] "Encycl Brit *Zum Versuch der zweiten Bearbeitung (während Heid. Anwesenheit)* und *Heid. 1–10*"(in Husserl's shorthand on a cover sheet preceding the article; only "Encycl Brit" and "Heid." are in Husserl's cursive; the rest is in shorthand; underlinings are from Husserl): *Hu* IX, p. 597 (and in part, 590). Note, however, that Heidegger's text takes up *eleven*, not ten, pages.

[10] "Dublette. Der neue Text für Heidegger 21–28 mit Heideggers kritischen Noten." *Hu* IX, p. 591.

THIRD DRAFT ("C")
[III, 4–6][11]

Draft C1 [=III, 6]

Form: typed original of third draft
Date: between October 23 and October 31 (?), 1927
Status: incomplete; much edited; served as basis for Draft D.
Title: none
Pages: 28 out of 52 pages

Draft C2 [=III, 4]

Form: carbon copy of typed original
Status: incomplete
Title: "Final draft – Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Phenomenology – Encyclopaedia Britannica. Last elaboration."[12] (from Husserl, on outer cover)
Pages: 48 out of 52 pages

Draft C3 [=III, 5]

Form: carbon copy of typed original
Status: only complete version of Draft C
Title: "Last draft, fourth copy."[13] (from Husserl, on outer cover)
Pages: 52 out of 52 pages

[11] Husserl calls Draft C "die größere Fassung" – "the larger draft." (*Hu* IX, p. 592, line 1).

[12] "Endfassung – phänomenologische Psychologie und transzendentale Phänomenologie – Encyclopaedia Britannica. Letzte Ausarbeitung": *Hu* IX, p. 591 with p. 605.

[13] "Letzte Fassung, 4. Duplikat." *Hu* IX, p. 591; cf. p. 605. (Why "fourth"?)

FOURTH DRAFT ("D")

Draft D1 [=I, 1]

Form: typed original
Date: between October 23 and December 1, 1927
Status: complete
Title: "A draft of the Encyclopaedia Britannica Article. The brackets are merely indications for the proposed abridgments, so as to stay within the restricted length of the English version (Salmon)."[14]
Pages: 33 out of 33 pages: pp. 1–31, plus 11a and 11b; eleven of these pages are taken from C1.

Draft D2 [=I, 2]

Form: second carbon copy of I, 1
Status: incomplete copy of typed original
Title: "Third copy of the Encyclopaedia Britannica article, not corrected. Lacking pages 3–4, 16 (which is p. 19 of the larger draft [i.e., Draft C]), 18–21, 22–23 (which are 26/27 of the larger draft), 30–31 ([which equals] p. 43, second paragraph through p. 45 [of the larger draft])."[15]
Pages: See immediately above.

---

[14] "Ein Entwurf zum Artikel der Encyclopaedia Britannica, die Einklammerungen sind bloß Anzeigen für Verkürzungen, vorgeschlagen um den vorgeschriebenen engen Raum des englischen Artikels (Salmon) innehalten zu können." The title is from Husserl, in shorthand on p. 1 of the text: *Hu* IX, pp. 592 and 605.

[15] "3. Abdruck des Encyclopaedia Britannica Artikels, nicht ausgebessert. Es fehlt 3–4, 16 (19 in der größeren Fassung), 18–21, 22–23 (26/27 der größeren Fassung), 30–31 (43, 2. Absatz - 45)." This title is from Husserl, in shorthand on p. 1 of the text: *Hu* IX, pp. 591–2. I take it that "3. Abdruck" refers to the *second* carbon copy of the typed original, the first carbon copy having been sent to Salmon. Thus, the typed original would be the "1. Abdruck," and the copy Salmon got would be the "2. Abdruck." On the folder-cover of D2 Father Van Breda identifies it as: – "Ein unvollständiges Exemplar der dritte (fast definitive) Fassung des Artikels "Phenomenology" der Encycl. Brit. Ende 1927 [V.B.]," i.e.," "An incomplete copy of the third (almost definitive) draft of the article "Phenomenology" for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. End of 1927 [Van Breda]."

SALMON'S CONDENSED TRANSLATION ("E")

E1b [=II, 2]

Form: carbon copy of lost original: Salmon's first condensed translation of Draft D (presumably made from the German D3).
Date: between December 1, 1927 and the end of February 1928.
Status: incomplete.
Title: "Phenomenology. / Edmund Husserl."
Pages: 22 out of 26 pages (plus two German pages appended): title page + unnumbered page with first paragraph of the translation + pp. 1–13, 17–19, 21–22 + two pages of bibliography ("Reference") in English, numbered 1 and 2. (The last two German pages of Draft A2 are appended.)[16]

E2a [=II, 1]

Form: typed original: Salmon's second condensed translation of Draft D, incorporating corrections to E1.
Date: by the end of February 1928.
Status: complete. No corrections by Husserl.
Title: "Encyclopaedia Britannica. / Phenomenology. / Edmund Husserl. / Done into English / by / Christopher V. Salmon." The title page bears a handwritten dedication: "Herrn Geheimrat Edmund Husserl, / with Affection and all Respect / from / Christopher V. Salmon. / Feb. 1928."
Pages: 25 pages: title page with dedication; unnumbered page containing the first paragraph of the translation; pp. 1–21; two pages of bibliography ("Reference"), numbered 1–2.

[16] Husserl removed pp. 14–16 and 20 and had Heidegger send them, with Husserl's corrections, to Christopher V. Salmon. See *Briefwechsel*, IV, p. 152 (March 5, 1928).

THE PUBLISHED VERSION ("F")

F

Form: printed in seven columns over four pages in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica: A New Survey of Universal Knowledge*, 14th edition London and New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1929, vol. 17, pp. 699–702. Signed "E. Hu."

Date: edited after February 1928, published September 1929

Status: Same as E2a except for orthographical changes and the omission of two manuscript pages of E2a.

Title: "Phenomenology"

EDMUND HUSSERL

THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE

EDITORIAL NOTES ON THE PRESENT EDITION OF THE EB ARTICLE

Page and line references:

Within the text of the translation I provide the pagination of the German texts:

(a) The pagination of the version published in *Hu* IX is given within square brackets, for example: [p. 237].

(b) The pagination of the original 1927 typescripts is given within angle brackets, for example: <p. 1>.

Within the footnotes to the translation I often indicate the *line* as well as the page of the German texts, separating the two by a period. For example:

(a) "*Hu* IX, p. 238.9" refers to *page* 238, *line* 9 of the published German version.

(b) "A1, p. 1.21" refers to *page* 1, *line* 21 of the typed manuscript of Draft A.

Heidegger's comments on Drafts A and B:

Heidegger's comments on Husserl's drafts are found in two different locations in *Hu* IX:

(a) Comments on the first draft (A) are found at pp. 592–97, as well as in some of the footnotes to the published version, pp. 239–53.

(b) Those on the second draft (B) are found at pp. 579–600 and 603–5, as well as in some of the footnotes to the published version.

(c) Heidegger's letter of October 22, 1927, with its three appendices, is published in *Hu* IX, pp. 600–02, and in *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 144–148.

In this translation, Heidegger's changes to, or remarks on, Drafts A and B are provided in the footnotes in boldface print.

The text of Draft B:

In *Hu* IX, pp. 264–270, Biemel *generally* uses B2 rather than B1, because the latter is so full of changes and cross-outs as to make a detailed presentation of the manuscript impractical. Nonetheless, Biemel occasionally gives not the original text but some of the legible changes that Husserl made in B1 (see *Hu* IX, p. 599ff.)

In the present translation of the second draft – as contrasted with the edition in *Hu* IX and all previous translations in any language – the "Introduction" and "Part I," which were written by Heidegger, follow *Heidegger's original text* as it appears in B1. The amendments and substitutions made to that text by both Heidegger and Husserl are given in the footnotes. The reason for this is that I

have wanted to present the original text that Heidegger read and commented on, rather than the text as Husserl revised it *afterwards* and *in the light of* Heidegger's comments.

However, within the sections that Husserl contributed – that is, Part II – I follow the text from Draft B2.

Pagination in Draft B, Sections ii-a, ii-b, and iii:
As I have argued above, the way in which the pages of Draft B were numbered is quite important. It is crucial, for example, in discerning the order in which the draft was written and typed. Therefore, I give both sets of page numbers for Sections ii-a, ii-b, and iii. Within angled brackets, page numbers that appear *without* quotation marks indicate the *final* page numbers of those Sections, whereas numbers *within* quotation marks are the *original* pages numbers. Thus, for example, the reference <p. 12="p. 1"> means that the page in question was originally numbered as "1" but was finally changed to "12."

Regarding paragraph breaks:
Husserl's and Heidegger's texts often run on at great length without paragraph breaks. In order to indicate obvious articulations within the text, as well as to aid in reading, I have added paragraph breaks where deemed suitable.

***Regarding section titles* within brackets:**
In order to show the relation of earlier drafts to the final Draft D, I have occasionally added section titles, within brackets, in Drafts A, B, and C. In those cases, the bracketed section titles are drawn from Draft D.

EDMUND HUSSERL

"PHENOMENOLOGY"
THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE

DRAFT A

Translated by Thomas Sheehan

[p. 237] <p. 1>

[Introduction]

The term *phenomenology* is generally understood to designate a philosophical movement, arising at the turn of this century, that has proposed a radical new grounding of a scientific philosophy and thereby of all sciences. But phenomenology also designates a new, fundamental science serving these ends, and here we must distinguish between psychological and transcendental phenomenology.

I. PSYCHOLOGICAL PHENOMENOLOGY AS "PURE" PSYCHOLOGY

[Phenomenological Reflection[1]]

1. Every experience and every other way we are consciously involved with objects clearly allows of a "phenomenological turn," a transferral into a process of "phenomenological experience." In simple perception we are directed toward perceived matters, in memory toward remembered matters, in thinking toward thoughts, in valuing toward values, in willing toward ends and means, and so on. Thus every such pursuit has its "object" [*Thema*]. But at any given

[1] *Hu* IX, p. 238.9–240.4. The material under this heading generally corresponds to some of the material in Draft D §2, "The Pure Psychical [etc.]."

time we can effect a change of focus that shifts our thematic gaze away from the current matters, thoughts, values, ends, etc., and directs our gaze instead toward the manifoldly changing "subjective ways" in which[2] they "appear," the ways they are consciously known.

For example, to perceive a fixed and unchanged brass cube means to run through its form as a cube – the individual surfaces, edges, corners, as well as its color, luster and other determinations as a spatial thing – **[p. 238]** and thus to bring the cube to cognizance for oneself. But instead of proceeding like that, we can attend phenomenologically to how – for example, in what kind of variously changing "perspectives" – **<p. 2>** the cube presents itself and yet is still *experienced as unchanged*; or how the very same cube appears differently as "something nearby" than as "something far off"; or which modes of appearance it offers when we change our orientation; and also how each individual determination within the process of perception presents itself as the one determination in the multiple modes of appearance belonging particularly to that perception.

This return to reflective experience teaches us that there is no progressively perceived thing, nor any element perceived as a determination within it, that does not appear, during perception, in multiplicities of different appearances, even though it is given and grasped as continuously one and the same thing. But in normal[3] ongoing perception, only this unity, only the thing itself, stands in the comprehending gaze while the functioning processes of lived experience remain extra-thematic, ungrasped, and latent. *Perception is not some empty "having"* of perceived things, but rather a flowing lived experience of subjective appearances synthetically uniting themselves in a consciousness of the self-same entity existing in this way or that. In this connection, "modes of appearance" is to be taken in the broadest sense. Thus, in the recollection of the cube or in the imagining of an entirely similar one, the modes of appearance are "the same" as in the perception [of the cube], but each of them is modified in a certain way, precisely insofar as it deals with memory or imagination. Again, differences such as those between a clearer and a more obscure memory, or those between gradations of clarity, or even between levels of relative definiteness or indefiniteness, are differences within the "modes of appearance." So too with differences of time-perspectives, **<p. 3>** of attention, and so forth.

---

[2] Heidegger (A1, p. 1.21, within the text) changes Husserl's German from "wie" to "**in denen**," i.e., from "how" or "as" to "**in which**." (Cf. *Hu* IX, p. 237.20). Unless otherwise noted, Heidegger's remarks appear in the left margin of Husserl's texts.

[3] Heidegger (A1, p. 2.13, within the text) changes "normal" [*normal*] to "**unreflective**" [***unreflektiert***]. See *Hu* IX, p. 238.15.

Quite analogously,[4] the thoughts, values, decisions, etc., in the corresponding lived experiences of thinking, valuing, willing, etc., are unities of hiddenly functioning "modes of appearance." For example,[5] the same judgment, with the same subject and predicate, is consciously known, within thinking, according to changing modes: sometimes as evident, sometimes as not evident; and in the latter case, sometimes as explicitly judged in step-by-step action and other times as not explicitly judged but rather as something that comes vaguely to mind. In these cases, in the transition from one mode to the other **[p. 239]** there arises the identifying consciousness of the same judgment, meant sometimes in one mode and sometimes in another. What holds true for the whole of a judgment or even a proof, or for a whole theory, also holds true for every thematic element, for every concept, every form of judgment, etc., [within that whole]. Here too, as everywhere else, the thematic unity is constituted in the synthesis of multiplicities of "phenomena" **<p. 4>** that are hidden but that can be disclosed at any time by means of phenomenological reflection, analysis, and description.

Thus there arises the *idea of a universal task*: Instead of living in "the" world directly in the "natural attitude" and, so to speak, like "children of this world"; that is, instead of living within the latently functioning life of consciousness and thereby having the world, and it alone, as our field of being – as now-existing for us (from out of perception), as past (from out of memory), as coming in the future (from out of expectation) – instead of judging and valuing this world of experience and making it the field of theoretical or practical projects – instead of all that, we attempt a universal phenomenological reflection on this entire life-process, be it pre-theoretical, theoretical or whatever. We attempt to disclose it systematically and thereby to understand the "how" of its achieving of unities; thus we seek to understand: in what manifold typical forms this life is a "consciousness-of"; how it constitutes synthetically conscious unities; how and in which forms these syntheses, as syntheses of passivity and spontaneous activity, run their course and thereby in particular how their unities are constituted as objectively existing or not existing, and the like; and thus finally how a unified world of experience and knowledge is there, operative and valid for us, in a completely familiar set of ontic types.

If it is the case that whatever is experienced, whatever is thought, and whatever is seen as the truth are given and are possible only within [the corre-

---

[4] The remainder of this sentence stems from Landgrebe, who substitutes it for some fourteen typed lines in Husserl's text: A1, p. 3.2–16. For the omitted text see *Hu* IX, p. 593, note to p. 238.32–35. We give Landgrebe's version, because the correction seems to have been made before the text was sent to Heidegger.

[5] Heidegger's note (A1, p. 3.17, shorthand; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 593):

"Thus, for example, what-is-adjudged in a judgment is repeated [*wiederholt*] as the same."

sponding acts of] experiencing, thinking, and insight, then the concrete and complete exploration of the world that exists and has scientific and evidential validity for us requires also the universal phenomenological exploration of the multiplicities of consciousness in whose synthetic changes the world subjectively takes shape as valid for us and perhaps as given with insight.[6] The task extends to the whole **[p. 240]** of life – including aesthetic life, valuing life of whatever type, **<p. 5>** and practical life – through which the concrete life-world with its changing content likewise continuously takes shape for us as a value-world and a practical world.[7]

[The Need for and Possibility of Pure Psychology[8]]

2. Does posing the task in this way lead to a new science?[9] Is there – corresponding to the idea of a universal experience directed exclusively to "subjective phenomena" – a self-contained field of experience that stands over against universal experience of the world, and thus a basis for a self-contained science? At first one may object that a new science is not required, since all merely subjective phenomena, all modes of appearance of what appears,

---

[6] Heidegger's note (A1 p. 4.24, German cursive; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 239.32 and n. 1): Heidegger underlines *erfordert* ["requires"] twice and writes:

"Why? First off, all it requires is that we exhibit and give a pure ontological clarification of its field, which lies behind us, as it were."

(More literally: "Why? First of all [what is required is] only to exhibit – purely in ontological clarification – its field, which lies in the rear, as it were."

[7] The text here reflects Landgrebe's changes in Husserl's text: A1, p. 5.2–4; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 593, note to p. 240.2–4. As the typing of A1, p. 4 shows, Landgrebe's changes were made before the A1 was sent to Heidegger.

[8] *Hu* IX, p. 240.5–241.36. The material under this heading generally corresponds to some of the material in Draft D §1, "Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology."

[9] Heidegger's note (A1, p. 5.6–7; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 593):

"Cf. 5a below."

Disposition of the note:

(1) What sentence is the note keyed to? Although Heidegger's note appears in the left margin at this point (A1, p. 5.5–6), it may be linked by a line to the last sentence of the previous paragraph (A1, p. 5.4); Biemel so takes it.

(2) What page does the note refer to? Heidegger is referring to ms. p. 5a, which is inserted between pp. 5 and 6 in both A1 and A2 and which, in *Hu* IX, corresponds to pp. 240.14–241.7 and, in the present translation, to the text running from "That is doubtless true" to the sentence, "From this vantage point...meaning and necessity of a pure psychology."

(3) What passage does the note refer to? I believe Heidegger's note refers to p. 240.15–18 (ms. p. 5a.3–5), i.e., to the second sentence of the next paragraph where, in A2, the latter half of the sentence (from "in much the same way" on) is crossed out. However, Biemel (*Hu* IX, p. 593) takes it as referring to all of p. 5a, i.e., *Hu* IX, pp. 240.32–241.7.

belong naturally within psychology as the science of the psychic.[10]

<p. 5a> Doubtless that is true. However, it leaves open [the fact] that[11] a purely self-contained psychological discipline is required here[12] in much the same way that a [pure science of] mechanics is required for an exclusively theoretical inquiry into movement and moving forces (taken as a mere structure of nature).

Let us consider the matter more closely. What is the general theme of psychology? Answer: Psychical being[13] and psychical life that exist concretely in the world as human and, more generally, as animal. Accordingly, psychology is a branch of the more concrete sciences of anthropology or zoology. Animal realities are of two levels, the first level being the basic one of physical realities. For, like all realities, animal realities are spatio-temporal, and they admit of a systematically abstractive focus of experience upon that factor in them that is purely "*res extensa*." This reduction to the purely physical brings us into the self-contained nexus of physical nature, to which animal organisms, as mere bodies, belong. Consequently, scientific exploration of this area takes its place within the universal unity of natural science and specifically within physical biology as the general science of organisms in purely physical experience.

But animals do not exist simply as nature; they exist as "subjects" of a "mental life," a life of experiencing, feeling, thinking, striving, etc. If, with systematic purity and a differently focused abstractive attitude, we put into practice the completely new kind of psychic experience (which, as psychological, is clearly the specific source of psychology), this orientation gives us the psychic in its pure and proper essential-ness and, so long as we direct our gaze unswervingly in this direction, **[p. 241]** this orientation leads continually from the purely psychic to the purely psychic. If we change our focus and interweave both kinds of experience, then there arises the combined psychophysical experience in which the real forms of the relatedness of the psychic to physical corporeality become thematic. From this vantage point it is easy to see the meaning and necessity of a pure psychology.

<p. 6>[14] All specifically psychological concepts obviously stem from

---

[10] At this point in both A1 and A2 (where p. 5.13 = *Hu* IX, p. 240.14) the second half of the page is crossed out along with the first three lines of p. 6; the deleted passage is reproduced in *Hu* IX, p. 593. For this deleted passage Husserl substitutes ms. p. 5a, which follows.

[11] Heidegger (A2, p. 5a.1, within the text) changes "*daß*" ("[the fact] that") to "*ob*" ("**whether**"), thus changing the reading to: "**...it leaves open [the question] whether....**"

[12] In A2, p. 5a.3–5, the remainder of this sentence is crossed out – although it is retained in *Hu* IX, p. 15–18 – and may be the referent of Heidegger's marginal note in the previous paragraph.

[13] Heidegger (A2, p. 5a.6, within the text) changes Husserl's "psychical being" [*Seelisches Sein*] to "**psychical entities**" (***Seelisch Seiendes***. ("*Seelisches* [also *Seelisch*] is capitalized because it begins the sentence.) See *Hu* IX, p. 240.19.

[14] The first two-and-a-half lines of A1, p. 6 are crossed out. Those lines, plus the second half of p. 5.14–27, were dropped in favor of p. 5a.

purely psychic experience, just as all specifically natural (natural-scientific) concepts stem from purely natural experience. Thus every scientific psychology rests on methodically scientific concept-formation in the area of purely psychic experience. If there are apodictic insights at work in such concepts, insights that can be gained by focusing on the purely psychic, then as "purely psychological" they must precede all psychophysical cognition.

Within the natural apperception of a human being taken as a concrete reality, there is already given his or her psychic subjectivity, the manifold [dimensions of the] psychic that can be experienced as a surplus over and above his or her corporeal *physis* and as a self-contained unity and totality of experience. If a "soul" (in this sense of experience) has a general structural essence – the typical form of its structure as regards psychic conditions, acts, and forms of a pure psychic synthesis – then the basic task of psychology, as first and foremost a *"pure" psychology*, must be to systematically explore these typical forms. However large the domain of psychophysical research may be, and however much it may contribute to our knowledge of the soul, there is one thing it can do only on the basis of a pure psychology, namely, exhibit the real relations of the psychic to *physis*. All the indirect indications of the psychic that are possible here, presuppose scientific experience of the purely psychic and knowledge of its essential structures.[15]

[Original Intuitive Experience: Two Levels]

<p. 7>[16] All experiential knowledge rests finally on original experience, on perception and the originally presentiating variations that derive from it.[17] **[p. 242]** Without an original intuitive example there is no original universalizing, no concept-formation. The same holds here. All of pure psychology's basic concepts – the ultimate theoretical elements of all psychology,[18] which pre-

[15] In the bottom margin of A1, p. 6.27 Husserl adds in shorthand: "Accordingly, among the 'basic concepts' of psychology – the original elements of psychological theory – the purely psychological concepts have intrinsic priority and precede psychophysical concepts and therefore all psychological concepts in general." (This sentence is taken over at this point in *Hu* IX, p. 241.32–36.) This shorthand sentence in A1 may be a replacement for the words "the ultimate theoretical elements of all psychology, which precede all other psychological concepts" from the next paragraph, which are crossed out in A1, p. 7.6–7 (but retained in *Hu* IX, p. 242.3–5).

[16] At this point in the typed ms. Husserl substitutes two typed pages, 7 and 7a, for a previous page 7. The first four lines of ms. p. 8, which followed from the original p. 7, are crossed out. They are reproduced in *Hu* IX, p. 594.

[17] Heidegger's note (A2, p. 7.1–5; cf. Hu IX, p. 594):

"Put this earlier, at least at page 6 above."

[18] Heidegger (A2, p. 7.6; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 594) writes

"Cf. p. 11."

The reference seems to be to A1, p. 11.5–6 (=*Hu* IX, p. 244.32–33), the second sentence under "4."

cede all other psychological concepts – must be drawn from original psychological intuition.[19] Such intuition has two levels: self-experience and intersubjective experience.[20]

The first,[21] which itself is gradated according to originality, is carried out in the form of self-perception and its variations (remembering oneself, imagining oneself); this provides the psychologist with original psychological intuitions, but only of his or her own (present, past, etc.) psychic [experience]. Obviously[22] the sense of any[23] experience of someone else's "interiority" implies that his or her interiority is an analogous variation of my own, such that the other person's interiority[24] can fit under the same basic concepts as (and no other than) those I originally fashioned from my experience of myself. Yes, the experience of personal community and community life, which is founded in experience of the self and of the other, does indeed yield new concepts, but they are concepts that in any case presuppose the concepts of self-experience.[25]

[Original Intuitive Experience of Oneself]

If we now ask what it is that first of all brings self-experience, both actual and possible, originarily to intuition, then Descartes' classical formula, the *ego cogito*, provides the only possible answer to that question – so long as we leave aside all the concerns that determined him in a transcendental-philosophical way. In other words, we hit upon nothing other than the *ego*, *consciousness*, and the *conscious object as such.* **<p. 7a>** In its purity, the

---

[19] Heidegger (A2, p. 7.8) suggests changing the passage to read: "**must be drawn from original intuition of the psychic as such.**" Husserl carries the change over into A1, p. 7.8 (= *Hu* IX, p. 242.6–7).

[20] Heidegger's note (A2, p. 7.10; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 594):

> **"An other in individuality or in community."**

In A2 Husserl changes the sentence to: "Such intuition has three levels founded one upon the other: self-experience, intersubjective experience, and community experience as such." This reading appears in *Hu* IX, p. 242.8–10.

[21] Heidegger (A2, p. 7.10, in the text) suggests beginning the sentence with "**the former**" (***Jene***: not *Diese* as in *Hu* IX, p. 594, note to p. 242.9), just as he will suggest beginning the next sentence with "**the latter.**" See the following footnote.

[22] Heidegger (A2, p. 7.14) suggests use of "the latter" (*diese*) here, so as to read perhaps: "**In the latter case obviously...**" Husserl does not carry over the suggestion into A2 (*Hu* IX, p. 242.14).

[23] Heidegger (A2, p. 7.15, within the text) adds the word "***intersubjektiven***" **["intersubjective"]** at this point.

[24] Husserl (A1 and A2, p. 7.16) adds "as an individual psyche," at this point. Cf. *Hu* IX, p. 242.16.

[25] Heidegger's note (A2, p. 7.16–21, keyed to the end of this sentence but apparently pertaining to the last two sentences of the paragraph; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 594):

> **"In the text there is a threefold [division]: self-experience, experience of someone else, experience of the life of the community. Bring these three together in a *stylistically* clearer way."**

Husserl seems to have appropriated this suggestion: see above re A2, p. 7.10, and *Hu* IX, p. 242.8–10.

psychic is nothing other than what we might call the specifically egoical: the life of consciousness and being-as-ego within that life. If, when we consider the human community, we also maintain a firm focus on the purely psychic, then over and above the pure individual subjects (psyches), there arise intersubjectivity's modes of consciousness that bind those subjects together on a purely psychic level. Among these are the "social acts" (appealing to other persons, making agreements with them, subduing their wills, and so on)[26] as well as, related to those, the abiding interpersonal bonds linking pure **[p. 243]** persons to personal communities at different levels. **<p. 8>**[27]

[The Phenomenological Reduction[28]]

3. *The correct performance of a pure phenomenological reflection*, as an originary intuition of the psychic in its pure particularity, is fraught with great difficulties; and the possibility of a pure psychology – and hence, of any psychology at all – depends on recognizing and overcoming them.[29] The method of "phenomenological reduction" is the basic method for throwing into relief the phenomenological-psychological field, and it alone has made "pure psychology" possible.

Let us, for example, **<p. 9>** try to grasp and describe any kind of external perception – say, the perception of this tree – as a purely psychic datum. Naturally the tree itself, which stands there in the garden, belongs not to the perception but to extra-mental nature. Nevertheless, the perception is what it is – namely, something psychic – [only] insofar as it is a perception "of this tree." Without the "of this" or "of that," a perception cannot be described in its

---

[26] The remainder of this sentence (=*Hu* IX, p. 242.37–243.2) appears in A1 and A2, p. 7a.8 as a shorthand addition by Husserl.

[27] Regarding what immediately follows in Draft A, p. 8: The first four lines of p. 8 are crossed out (this was part of the substitution of pp. 7 and 7a for the original p. 7) and the next fifteen lines are bracketed. The omitted text is reproduced in *Hu* IX, pp. 594–595.

[28] *Hu* IX, p. 243.3–244.29. The material under this heading corresponds generally to Draft D, §3, "The Self-contained Field of the Purely Psychical. – Phenomenological Reduction and True Inner Experience."

[29] Heidegger's note (A1, p. 8.20–27, left and bottom margins, keyed to the first two sentences of this paragraph):

> **"More succinctly:**
> **The possibility of a pure psychology in general depends on the *correct performance* of the original intuition of the psychic as such. This performance is determined and guided by the 'phenomenological reduction.' The essential characteristics of this method are the following:**
> **1. a view of the psychic as essentially intentional;**
> **2. in connection with that, the epoché;**
> **3. constitution of the *intentum* in the multiplicity of its modes of appearance;**
> **4. [the] universal validity of this basic structure of the method in keeping with the universality of the intentional structure."**

own essential psychic make-up. The inseparability of this element is shown by the fact that it remains with the perception even when the perception is shown to be an illusion. Whether the natural object truly exists or not, the perception is a perception *of* it and is given to me in phenomenological reflection as that.[30]

Thus, in order to grasp the purely psychic [element] of a *cogito* of the type "perception," the psychologist must, on the one hand, abstain from taking any position on the actual being of the perceived (i.e., of the *cogitatum*); that is, he must perform an epoché as regards that and thereafter make no natural perceptual judgments, since the very sense of such judgments always entails an assertion about objective being and non-being. On the other hand,[31] however, the *most essential thing of all* should not be overlooked, namely that even after this purifying epoché, perception still remains perception of this house, indeed, of this house with the accepted status of "actually existing." In other words, the pure make-up of my perception includes the perceptual object – but purely as perceptually meant, and specifically as the sense-content (the perceptual sense) of the perceptual belief.

But in the epoché, this "perceived house" (the "bracketed" house, as we say) belongs to the phenomenological content not as **[p. 244]** a rigid, lifeless element but rather as a vitally self- **<p. 10>** -constituting unity in the fluctuating multiplicities of modes of appearance, each of which intrinsically has the character of an "appearance of..." (e.g., views of, appearance-at-a-distance of, etc.), and each of which, in the course of interrelated appearances, synthetically produces the consciousness of one and the same thing. It is clear that exactly the same point holds true for every kind of *cogito*, for every kind of "I experience," "I think," "I feel," "I desire," and so on.

In each case the reduction to the phenomenological, as the purely psychic, demands that we methodically refrain from taking any natural-objective position; and not only that, but also from taking any position on the particular values, goods, etc., that the subject, in his or her naturally functioning *cogitationes*, straightforwardly accepts as valid in any given case. In each instance the task is to pursue the at first incalculable plethora of modes in which the respective "intentional objectivities" (the perceived as such, the remembered as such, the thought and the valued as such, etc.) are gradually "constituted" as synthetic unities of multiplicities of consciousness; the task is also to disclose the manifold forms of syntheses whereby, in general, consciousness combines

---

[30] Heidegger (A1, p. 9.11, within the text) changes *als das* ("as that") to ***als solches*** ("**as such**"). Cf. *Hu* IX, p. 243.23.

[31] Heidegger's note (A1, p. 9.19–25, keyed to this and the next sentence; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 595):

"Make this point at the beginning, and from that the necessity of the epoché will become clear."

Husserl copied the remark, in shorthand, into the corresponding margin of A2 and, while leaving the passage in the same place, made some changes in it. See *Hu* IX, p. 243.30 and p. 595.

with consciousness into the unity of a consciousness.[32] But other than "consciousness-of" – always centered on the same pole of unity, the ego – there is nothing to be found here. Every psychic datum can itself be exhibited only as a unity that refers back to constituting multiplicities. Pure psychology (and consequently any psychology at all) must begin with the data of actual experience, that is to say, with my pure egoical lived experiences as perceptions-of, remembrances-of, and things of that sort, and never with hypotheses and abstractions, such as "sense data" and the like are.

[Eidetic Reduction. Pure Eidetic Psychology as the Foundation for Empirical Psychology[33]]

4. Phenomenological or pure psychology as an intrinsically primary and completely self-contained psychological discipline, which is also **<p. 11>** sharply separated from natural science, is, for very fundamental reasons, not to be established as an empirical science but rather as a purely rational ("*a priori*," "eidetic") science. As such[34] it is the necessary foundation for any rigorous empirical science dealing with the laws of the psychic, quite the same way that the purely rational disciplines of nature – pure geometry, kinematics, chronology, mechanics – are the foundation for every possible "exact" empirical science of nature. **[p. 245]** Just as the grounding of such an empirical science would require a systematic disclosure of the essential forms of nature in general, without which it is not possible to think nature – and more specifically, spatial and temporal form, movement, change, physical substantiality and causality – so too a scientifically "exact" psychology requires a disclosure of the *a priori* typical forms without which it is not possible to think the I (or the we), consciousness, the objects of consciousness, and hence any psychic life at all, along with all the distinctions and essentially possible forms of syntheses that are inseparable from the idea of an individual and communal psychic whole.

Accordingly, the method of phenomenological reduction is connected with

---

[32] Heidegger's note (A1, p.10.20; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 595):

"Cf. p. 11"

[= *Hu* IX, p. 245 line 12ff.]

[33] *Hu* IX, p. 244.30–247.3. The material under this heading corresponds to material found in D §5, "The Fundamental Function of Pure Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Psychology" and §4, "Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as an Eidetic Science."

[34] Heidegger's note (A1, p. 11.6):

"Cf. p. 7"

Heidegger seems to be referring A1 and A2, p. 7.6 (see above). Husserl copies Heidegger's note into the corresponding place in A2, but with the remark: "However, there [i.e., p. 7.6, = *Hu* IX, p. 242.3–4] the discussion was only about concepts as first theoretical elements."

the method of psychological inquiry into essence, as *eidetic* inquiry:[35] that is to say, exclusion not only of all judgments that go beyond pure conscious life (exclusion, therefore, of all natural positive sciences) but also of all purely psychological factuality. Such factuality serves only as an exemplar, a basis for the free variation of possibilities, whereas what we are seeking to ascertain is the *invariant* that emerges in the variation, the *necessary typical form*, which is bound up with the ability to be thought. So, for example, the phenomenology of the perception of spatial things is not a doctrine about **<p. 12>**[36] external perceptions that either factually occur or empirically can be expected; rather, it sets forth the necessary system of structures without which it is not possible to think a synthesis of manifold perceptions as perceptions of one and the same thing. Among[37] the most important of the psychological-phenomenological syntheses to be explored are the syntheses of *confirmation*, for example, the way that, in external perception, consciousness – in the form of agreement and via the fulfillment of anticipatory pre-grasps – appropriates to itself evidential belief in the being [of something], and does so as a consciousness of the self-showing thing itself. Correlatively: there is the exploration of modalizations, doubtfulness, mere likelihood, and perhaps evident nullity as counterforms of the syntheses of agreement – and so on for every kind of act (a pure psychology of reason).

[Reduction to Pure Intersubjectivity]

5. The first phenomenological reduction, the one described above, is the egological reduction; and so too phenomenology in the first **[p. 246]** instance is the phenomenology of the essential possibilities only of my own originally intuitive ego (*egological phenomenology*). However, a phenomenology of empathy and of the way empathy, as a synthesis of phenomena in my mind,

---

[35] Heidegger's note (A1, p. 11.18–20):

"Cf. p. 10."

Husserl copies this note into the corresponding marginal place in A2. Biemel takes this as referring to *Hu* IX, p. 244.19–21, i.e., in the present translation, to the words "disclose the manifold forms of syntheses whereby, in general, consciousness combines with consciousness into the unity of a consciousness."

[36] Here at the beginning of A2, p. 12, in the top margin, Heidegger writes (and underlines):

"p. 11 in Landgrebe"

which Biemel (*Hu* IX, p. 595, re 245.21) takes as referring to the opening sentence of paragraph "4" above. It is at least possible, however, that Heidegger is referring to Landgrebe's typescript of Husserl's "Studien zur Struktur des Bewusstseins," which Heidegger had just read.

[37] From this sentence to the end of the paragraph the text is bracketed in A1 and A2 (p. 12.5–14). In A1 it is marked with a deletion sign. In the left margin of A1 (cf. *Hu* IX, p. 245, n. 1) Heidegger writes:

"Transcendental questions!"

can run its course with harmony and confirmation and can then, with consistent confirmation, indicate a "foreign subjectivity" – all of that leads to the expansion of the phenomenological reduction into a *reduction to pure intersubjectivity*. There then arises, as purely psychological phenomenology in its completeness, the eidetic doctrine of a community constituted purely psychologically, in whose intersubjectively entwined acts (acts of community life) there is constituted the "objective" **<p. 13>** world (the world for everyone) as "objective" nature, as a world of culture and as a world of "objectively" existing communities.

[The History of Phenomenological Psychology[38]]

6. The idea of a pure, non-psychophysical psychology fashioned purely from psychological experience goes back historically to Locke's noteworthy and foundational work, while the development and elaboration of what Locke started is carried out by the empiricist movement to which he gave rise. The movement culminates in David Hume's brilliant *A Treatise [of Human Nature]*. One can see it as the first projection of a pure psychology carried through in almost perfect [*reiner*] consistency (even though it is only an egological psychology); yet it is nothing less than the first attempt at a phenomenological transcendental philosophy.

We can distinguish two tendencies that are mingled already in Locke, namely, the positive-psychological and the transcendental-philosophical. However, in spite of its many deep premonitions and its rich promise, this movement comes to grief in both areas. It lacks any radical reflection on the goal and possibilities of a pure psychology, and it lacks the basic method of phenomenological reduction. Being blind to consciousness as consciousness-of ("intentionality") means being blind as well to the tasks and special methods that flow from this view of consciousness. In the final analysis empiricism also lacks insight into the necessity of a rational eidetic doctrine of the purely psychic sphere. In the intervening years all of this also precluded any radical grounding of pure psychology and hence of a rigorously scientific psychology in general.

The first decisive impulse [in that direction] was given by Franz Brentano **[p. 247]** (*Psychologie*, I, 1874)[39] by means of his great discovery that con-

---

[38] *Hu* IX, p. 245.37–247.23. In all the later drafts, the material under this heading was combined with the material that comes in the next section (II. 1), and the combination was made into a single section that opens Part II. In Draft D that single section is §6, "Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Locke's Psychologism."

[39] [Translator's note: Franz Brentano, *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot, 2 volumes, 1874; second edition, ed. Oskar Kraus, Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 2 vols. 1924–1925, reprinted: Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1955. English translation: *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, ed.

sisted in his revaluation of the scholastic concept of intentionality into an essential characteristic of **<p. 14>** "mental phenomena." But still inhibited by naturalistic prejudices, even Brentano does not see the problems of synthesis and intentional constitution, and he does not find the way through to establishing a pure, indeed an eidetic, psychology in our sense of phenomenology. Nonetheless, his discovery alone made possible the phenomenological movement that began at the turn of this century.

Drawing the parallel between this pure and *a priori* psychology on the one hand and pure and *a priori* natural science (e.g., geometry) on the other makes it clear that this psychology is not a matter of empty "*a priori* speculations." Rather, it consists of rigorously scientific work carried out in the framework of concrete psychological intuition, the work of systematically shaping pure psychological concepts – along with the evident, necessarily valid laws of essence that pertain to them – into an infinite but systematic hierarchical series. On the other hand, we should not presuppose here even the scientific character of the *a priori* sciences long known to us. Corresponding to the fundamentally *sui generis* nature of the psychic there is the equally unique system of its *a priori* and its entire method.

II. TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY AS CONTRASTED WITH PSYCHOLOGICAL PHENOMENOLOGY

[The Historical Intertwining of Phenomenological and Transcendental Phenomenology, and the Need to Distinguish the Two[40]]

1. The new phenomenology did not originally arise as pure psychology and thus was not born of a concern for establishing a radically scientific psychology;[41] rather, it arose as "*transcendental phenomenology*" with the purpose of reforming philosophy into a strict science. Because transcendental and psychological phenomenology have fundamentally different meanings, they must be kept most rigorously distinct. This is the case even though one science turns into the other through a mere change in focus, **<p. 15>** such that the "same"

Oskar Kraus, English edition by Linda L. McAlister, translated by Antos C. Rancurello, D. B. Terrell, and Linda L. McAlister, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Humanities Press, 1973.]

[40] *Hu* IX, p. 247.24–249.4. The material under this heading generally corresponds to Draft D, §6, with intimations of §7 (the need to distinguish the transcendental and the psychological problematics; cf. pp. 248.15–28: Descartes' transcendental view) and §8 (the inadequacies of psychologism; cf. pp. 248.28–249.4: Locke's psychologism).

[41] Heidegger's (erased) marginal note (A1, p. 14.23; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 247, n. 1):

"Rational psychology!"

In A1 and A2 Husserl changed his text here to read: "establishing a strictly scientific empirical psychology." See *Hu* IX, p. 247.25–26.

phenomena and eidetic insights occur in both sciences, **[p. 248]** albeit under a different rubric, so to speak, which changes their meaning fundamentally.

Even Locke's interest lay not primarily in establishing a pure psychology; rather, this was to be only the means to a universal solution of the *problem of "understanding."* Thus his primary theme was the enigma of the functions of understanding that are carried out as knowledge and science within subjectivity while making claims to objective validity. In short, Locke's *Essay* was intended as the projection of a theory of knowledge, a transcendental philosophy. He[42] and his school have been charged with "psychologism." But if the thrust of the transcendental problem is to interrogate the sense and the legitimacy of an objectivity that becomes consciously known in the immanence of pure subjectivity and that presumably is demonstrated within the subjective grounding-processes, then this question equally concerns anything and everything objective.

[Intimations of the Transcendental Problem] Already in Descartes' *Meditations* (and this is precisely the reason why he was the epoch-making awakener of the transcendental problematic) the insight was already prepared, namely, that, as far as the knowing ego is concerned, everything we declare to really be and to be-thus-and-so – and finally this means the whole universe – *is* only as something believed-in within subjective beliefs, and is-thus-and-so only as something represented, thought, and so on, as having this or that sense. Hence, the subjective conscious life in pure immanence is the place where all sense is bestowed and all being is posited and confirmed. Thus if we are to clarify what subjectivity can and does accomplish here in its hidden immanence, we need a systematic and pure self-understanding **<p. 16>** of the knower, a disclosure of the life of thinking, exclusively by means of "inner experience."

[Psychologism] Although Locke was guided by this great insight, he lacked the [necessary] basic purity and fell into the error of psychologism. Insofar as objective-real experience and knowledge in general were being subjected to transcendental questioning, it was absurd of him to presuppose any kind of objective experiences and knowledge – as if the very sense and legitimacy of their objective validity were not themselves part of the problem. A psychology could not be the foundation of transcendental philosophy. Even pure psychology in the phenomenological sense, thematically delimited by the psychological-phenomenological reduction, still is and always will be a positive science: it has the world as its pre-given foundation. The pure psyches **[p. 249]** and

[42] This and the next sentence are joined within brackets in A2, p. 15.12–19. In the left margin there is a note in shorthand, possibly from Heidegger:

"Unusable."

The sentences are retained in *Hu* IX, p. 248.10–15.

communities of psyches [that it treats] are psyches that belong to bodies in nature that are presupposed but simply left out of consideration. Like every positive science, this pure psychology[43] is itself transcendentally problematic.

[The Transcendental Reduction and the Semblance of Doubling[44]]

But the objectives of a transcendental philosophy require a broadened and fully universal phenomenological reduction (the transcendental reduction) that does justice to the universality of the problem and practices an "epoché" regarding the whole world of experience and regarding all the positive cognition and sciences that rest on it, transforming them all into phenomena – transcendental phenomena.

Descartes had already touched upon this reduction insofar as (in keeping with his methodical principle of epoché with regard to everything that can possibly be doubted) he puts out of play the being of the whole world of experience; he already recognizes that what remains in play thereafter is the *ego cogito* as the *universum* of pure **<p. 17>** subjectivity and that this pure subjectivity – which is not to be taken as the [empirical] I, "this man"[45] – is the entity that is, in its immanent validity, presupposed by, and therefore has intrinsic priority over, all positive cognition. If to this we add Locke's momentous recognition of the necessity of describing cognitive life concretely in all its basic kinds and levels, plus Brentano's discovery of intentionality in its new utilization, plus finally the recognition of the necessity of *a priori* method, then what results is the theme and method of present-day transcendental phenomenology. Instead of a reduction merely to purely psychic subjectivity (the pure minds of human beings in the world), we get a reduction to transcendental subjectivity by means of a methodical epoché regarding the real world as such and even regarding all ideal objectivities as well (the "world" of number and such like). What remains in validity is exclusively the *universum* of "transcendentally pure" subjectivity and, enclosed within it, all the actual and possible "phenomena" of objectivities, all modes of appearance and modes of consciousness that pertain to such objectivities, and so forth.

---

[43] Heidegger's note (A1, p. 16.17; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 249, n.1):

"as empirical" [underlined in the original]

Husserl transcribed this, in cursive, into the corresponding margin of A2.

[44] *Hu* IX, pp. 249.4–250.24. The material here generally corresponds to Draft D, §9, from which we derive this title.

[45] Heidegger (A1, p. 17.2; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 249, n. 2) glosses "this man" with:

"but rather [is to be taken] as 'manness.' " [***"wohl aber als 'Menschheit'"***].

Biemel (*Hu* IX, p. 249, n. 2) in turn glosses "manness" with: "understood as the essence of man." Husserl transcribed Heidegger's note, in cursive, into the corresponding margin of A2.

Only by means of this radical method does transcendental phenomenology avoid the contradiction of the epistemological circle: in particular, presupposing **[p. 250]** (as if it were beyond question) that which is included [as questionable] in the general thrust of transcendental questioning itself. Moreover, only at this point can we fully understand the temptation of psychologism. Now we can easily see that in a certain way purely psychological phenomenology in fact coincides with transcendental phenomenology, proposition for proposition – **<p. 18>** except that what their respective assertions understand by the phenomenologically pure [realm] is, in the one case, the psychic, a stratum of being within the naturally accepted world, and, in the other case, the transcendental-subjective, where the sense and existential validity of the naturally accepted world originate. The transcendental reduction opens up, in fact, a completely new kind of experience that can be systematically pursued: transcendental experience. Through the transcendental reduction, *absolute* subjectivity, which functions everywhere in hiddenness, is brought to light along with its whole transcendental life, in whose intentional syntheses all real and ideal objects, with their positive existential validity, are constituted. The transcendental reduction yields the thematic field of an absolute phenomenological science, called the transcendental science because it encompasses within itself all transcendental or rational-theoretical inquiries. On the other hand, the transcendental theory of reason is distinguished from it only in the starting point of its inquiries, since carrying out such a theory presupposes the universal *studium* of the whole of transcendental subjectivity. It is one and the same *a priori* science.

[Transcendental Philosophy as Universal Ontology[46]]

2. All positive sciences are sciences [that function] in transcendental naïveté. Without realizing it, they do their research with a one-sided orientation in which the entire life that transcendentally constitutes the real unities of experience and knowledge remains hidden to these sciences – even though, as one can see clearly only after our reductions, all such unities, according to their own cognitional sense, are what they are only as unities of transcendentally constituting multiplicities. Only transcendental phenomenology (and **<p. 19>** its transcendental idealism consists in nothing other than this) makes possible sciences that deal with the fully concrete, comprehensive sciences, which implies: sciences that thoroughly understand and justify themselves. The theme of transcendental phenomenology has to do with any and every

[46] *Hu* IX, p. 250.25–251.23. The material corresponds generally to Draft D, III, §11, from which we derive this title.

possible subjectivity as such, in whose conscious life **[p. 251]** and constitutive experiences and cognitions a possible objective world comes to consciousness.

The world as experienced in factual experience is the theme of the fully thought-out system of the positive empirical sciences. But on the basis of a free ideal variation of factual experience in relation to its world of experience there arises the idea of possible experience in general as experience of a possible world, and consequently the idea of the possible system of experiential sciences as belonging *a priori* to the unity of a possible world. So, on the one hand there is an *a priori* ontology that systematically explores the structures that essentially and necessarily belong to a possible world, that is, everything without which a world as such could not be ontically thought. But on the other hand there is phenomenological correlation-research, which explores the possible world and its ontic structures (as a world of possible experience) with regard to the possible bestowal of sense and the establishment of being, without which that world equally could not be thought. In this way transcendental phenomenology, once realized, encompasses a universal ontology in a broadened sense: a full, universal, and concrete ontology in which all correlative ontological concepts are drawn from a transcendental originality that leaves no questions of sense and legitimacy in any way unclarified.

[Phenomenology and the Crisis in Foundations of the Exact Sciences[47]]

<p. 20> The *a priori* sciences that have developed historically do not at all bring to realization the full idea of a positive ontology. They deal only (and in this regard, even incompletely) with the logical form of every possible world (formal *mathesis universalis*) and the eidetic form of a possible physical nature. They remain stuck in transcendental naïveté and consequently are burdened with those shortcomings in foundation-building that necessarily follow from it. In this naïve form they function as methodological instruments for the corresponding "exact" empirical sciences, or to put it more accurately, they serve: to rationalize the regions of empirical data; to supply a *methexis* between the factual and the necessary by means of a reference back to the eidetic structure of a possible world-fact in general; and thereby to provide a foundation of laws to undergird merely inductive rules. The "basic concepts" of all positive sciences – those from out of which all concepts of worldly reality are built – are at the same time the basic concepts of the corresponding rational sciences. **[p. 252]** If there is any lack of clarity as regards their origins, and consequently any failure regarding knowing their genuine and necessary

[47] *Hu* IX, p. 251.23–252.15. The material corresponds generally to Draft D, III, §12, from which we take this title.

sense, this lack of clarity gets transmitted to the whole theoretical make-up of the positive sciences. In most recent times the defectiveness of all positive sciences has been disclosed by the crisis of foundations into which all positive, empirical and *a priori* sciences have fallen, as well as by the battle over the "paradoxes," over the either genuine or merely apparent evidentiality of the traditional basic concepts and principles in arithmetic, chronology, and so forth. In light of the whole character of their method, the positive sciences can no longer be considered genuine sciences – sciences that **<p. 21>** can completely understand and justify themselves and that can sketch out sure paths for themselves with comprehensive insight. Modern science can be liberated from this intolerable situation only by a phenomenological reform.

[The Phenomenological Grounding of the Factual Sciences[48]]

According to what we said earlier, transcendental phenomenology is called upon to develop the idea, which it harbors within itself, of a universal ontology elevated to the transcendental level and thus brought to concrete comprehensiveness – that is, the idea of a science of the system of eidetic forms of every possible world of cognition as such and of the correlative forms of their intentional constitution. Accordingly, phenomenology is the original locus of the basic concepts of all *a priori* sciences (as branches of the one ontology) and hence of all the corresponding empirical sciences of our factual world – basic concepts that are to be formed in originary genuineness and that, as regards their phenomenological development, are, from the outset, free of any unclarity. As it unfolds systematically, this phenomenological ontology prepares all the as yet ungrounded *a priori* sciences and thus prepares for the development of all empirical sciences into "exact" (rationalized) sciences. An important step in that direction is the founding of an *a priori* pure psychology that functions for empirical psychology the way *a priori* geometry, etc., functions for empirical physics. This idea will necessarily determine the work of the next one hundred years.[49] A major task contained therein is the phenomenological interpretation of history and of the universal "sense" contained in its unrepeatability.

3. The phenomenology of emotional and volitional life with the intentionality proper to it, [which is] founded on the **[p. 253]** phenomenology **<p. 22>** of natural experience and knowledge, encompasses the whole of culture according to its necessary and possible eidetic forms as well as the correlative *a*

---

[48] *Hu* IX, p. 252.15–253.21. The material corresponds generally to that in Draft D, III, §13, from which we derive this title.

[49] This sentence is struck out in both A1 and A2, p. 21.23–24.

priori that belongs to the eidetic forms of sociality. Obviously every normative discipline and every philosophical discipline in the specialized sense belongs within the circle of phenomenology, just as, historically, philosophical phenomenology arose in connection with clarifying the idea of a pure logic, a formal axiology, and a theory of practice. Phenomenology is anti-metaphysical insofar as it rejects every metaphysics concerned with the construction of purely formal hypotheses.[50] But like all genuine philosophical problems, all metaphysical problems return to a phenomenological base, where they find their genuine transcendental form and method fashioned from intuition. Moreover, phenomenology is not at all a system-philosophy in the traditional style, but rather a science that works via systematic, concrete investigations. Even the lowest level – the purely descriptive eidetic analysis of the structures of a transcendentally pure subjectivity (of the ego as a monad) – is already an immense field of concrete investigative work, whose results are basic for all philosophy (and psychology).

[The Phenomenological Resolution of All Philosophical Antitheses[51]]

As the work of phenomenology advances systematically from intuitive data to abstract heights, the old traditional ambiguous antitheses of philosophical standpoints get resolved by themselves without the tricks of argumentative dialectics or feeble efforts at compromise – antitheses such as those between rationalism (Platonism) and empiricism, subjectivism and objectivism, idealism and realism, ontologism and transcendentalism, psychologism and anti-psychologism, positivism and metaphysics, between a teleological[52] conception of the world and a causalistic one. **<p. 23>** On both sides there are legitimate reasons, but also half-truths and inadmissible absolutizations of partial positions that are only relatively and abstractly justified. Subjectivism can be overcome only by the most universal and consistent subjectivism (transcendental subjectivism). In this form **[p. 254]** subjectivism is at the same time objectivism, insofar as it defends the rights of every objectivity that is to

---

[50] Heidegger's note (A2, p. 22.10; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 253, n. 1):

> **"*or*: and all the more so insofar as one understands metaphysics as the presentation of a world-view that is performed in the natural attitude and that is always tailored only to the natural attitude in particular historical situations of life – those of life's specifically factical cognitional possibilities."**
>
> **["*oder* und erst recht sofern man unter Metaphysik die Darstellung eines Weltbildes versteht, das in der natürlichen Einstellung vollzogen und je nur auf sie in bestimmten historischen Situationen des Lebens – seiner gerade faktischen Erkenntnismöglichkeiten – zugeschnitten ist."]

[51] *Hu* IX, p. 253.21–254.38. The material corresponds generally to Draft D, III, §16, whence we take this title.

[52] In *Hu* IX, p. 253.31, this word, *teleologischer* is misprinted as *theologischer*.

be demonstrated by harmonious experience, but indeed also brings to validity its full and genuine sense, against which the so-called realistic objectivism sins in its misunderstanding of transcendental constitution. Again it has to be said: Empiricism can [be overcome[53]] only by the most universal and consistent empiricism that, in place of the narrowed-down "experience" of the empiricists, posits the necessarily broadened concept of experience – originarily giving intuition – that in all its forms (intuition of the *eidos*, apodictic evidence, phenomenological intuition of essence, etc.) demonstrates the kind and form of its legitimation by means of phenomenological clarification. Phenomenology as eidetics, on the other hand, is rationalistic; it overcomes narrow, dogmatic rationalism by means of the most universal rationalism, that of eidetic research related in a unified way to transcendental subjectivity, ego-consciousness and conscious objectivity. The same goes for the other mutually intertwined antitheses. Within its doctrine of genesis, phenomenology treats the eidetic doctrine of association: it purifies and justifies Hume's preliminary discoveries but then goes on to show that the essence of transcendental subjectivity as well as its system of eidetic laws are thoroughly teleological. Phenomenology's transcendental idealism harbors natural realism entirely within itself, but it proves itself not by aporetic argumentation but by the consistency of phenomenological work itself. Phenomenology joins ranks with Kant in the battle against the shallow ontologism of concept-analysis, but it is itself an ontology, albeit one drawn from transcendental "experience." Phenomenology repudiates every philosophical "renaissance"; as a philosophy of self-reflection at its most original and its most universal, it is directed to concepts, problems and insights **<p. 24>**[54] that one achieves by oneself, and yet it does get stimulation from the great men and women of the past, whose earlier intuitions it corroborates while transposing them to the firm ground of concrete research that one can take up and carry through. It demands of the phenomenologist that he or she personally renounce the ideal of a philosophy that would be only one's own and, instead, as a modest worker in a community with others, live for a *philosophia perennis*.[55]

---

[53] The bracketed words are supplied by Biemel: *Hu* IX, p. 254.7–8.

[54] Pp. 24–25 of A2 were removed by Husserl and are found appended to the end of Christopher V. Salmon's first draft of the condensed translation.

[55] This last sentence is taken over virtually verbatim as the last sentence of Draft C, p. 45.15–18 and (since this p. 45 was imported, renumbered, into Draft D) of Draft D, p. 31.15–18.

[p. 255]

LITERATURE[56]

1. GENERAL ISSUES AND BASIC WORKS

The organ of the phenomenological movement:

Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung, eds., E. Husserl and others, Halle 1913 ff., eight volumes up to now. (Hereafter abbreviated: *Jb.*)[57]

E. Husserl,

Logische Untersuchungen, 2 vols., 1900/01, 3 vols. in the new editions. (The breakthrough work).

———,

"Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft," *Logos*, vol. I, 1913.

———,

Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie, vol. I, 1913 (= *Jb.* I). (Method and problematic).

M. Scheler,

Abhandlungen und Aufsätze, Leipzig, 1915, in a more recent edition under the title *Vom Umsturz der Werte,* 1918.

———,

Die Wissensformen und die Gesellschaft, Leipzig, 1926.

A. Reinach,

Gesammelte Schriften, Halle, 1922.

M. Heidegger,

Sein und Zeit, Halle, 1927 (= *Jb.* VIII).

D. Mahnke,

"Eine neue Monadologie," *Kantstudien*, Supplementary vol. 39, 1917.[58]

Philosophische Anzeiger, Bonn, 1925 ff.

In large measure oriented along phenomenological lines.

Chr. Salmon,

Hume's Philosophy (in English)[59]

---

[56] Heidegger's note (A2, p. 24.8; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 597):

"Dates" [*Jahreszahlen*].

The remaining footnotes in this bibliography are taken from pp. 24 and 25 of A2, found with Salmon's first translation draft..

[57] For a brief history of the *Jahrbuch* see Karl Schuhmann, "Husserl's Yearbook," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 50, Supplement (Fall 1990), 1–25.

[58] Following the Mahnke entry, there is typed in and then crossed out: "W. Reyer. *Einführung in die Phänomenologie*, Leipzig 1926."

[59] This entry refers to the dissertation that Christopher V. Salmon had written under Husserl's direction and defended in the summer of 1927. It was published late in 1928 as: "The Central Problem of Hume's

2. LOGIC AND FORMAL ONTOLOGY

A. Pfänder,

Logik, Halle, 1921 (= *Jb.* IV).

M. Heidegger,

Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus, Tübingen, 1916.

R. Ingarden,

"Essenziale Fragen," 1925 (= *Jb.* VII).

3. PSYCHOLOGY

A. Pfänder,

"Psychologie der Gesinnungen," 1913 (= *Jb.* I).

W. Schapp,

Beiträge zur Phänomenologie der Wahrnehmung, Halle, 1910.

4. ETHICS

M. Scheler,

Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik, 1913f. (= *Jb.* I, II).[60]

5. AESTHETICS

M. Geiger,

Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses, Halle, 1913.

R. Odebrecht,

Grundlegung einer ästhetischen Werttheorie, Berlin, 1927.

6. PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE

O. Becker,

"Beiträge zur phänom[enologischen] Begründung der Geometrie," 1923 (= *Jb.* VI).

———,

Mathematische Existenz, Halle, 1927 (= *Jb.* VIII).

H. Conrad-Martius,

"Realontologie, I," 1922/23 (= *Jb.* VI).

7. PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

M. Scheler,

Vom Ewigen im Menschen, Leipzig, 1921.

Philosophy: A Phenomenological Interpretation of the *Treatise on Human Nature*" in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* IX (1928), 299–449.

[60] In the margin next to the Scheler entry Husserl wrote: "D. v. Hildebrand," i.e., Dietrich von Hildebrand.

K. Stavenhagen,
Absolute Stellungnahmen, Erlangen, 1925.
Jean Héring,
Phénoménologie et philosophie religieuse, Strasbourg, 1925.
<p. 25>

8. PHILOSOPHY OF LAW; SOCIOLOGY

A. Reinach,
Die apriorischen Grundlagen des bürgerlichen Rechts, 1913 (= *Jb.* I).

F. Kaufmann,
Logik und Rechtswissenschaft, Tübingen, 1922.
F. Schreier,
Grundbegriffe und Grundformen des Rechts, Vienna, 1924.
Gerh. Husserl,
Rechtskraft und Rechtsgeltung, I., Berlin, 1925.
M. Scheler,
Wesen und Formen der Sympathie, Bonn, 1923.
Th. Litt,
Individuum und Gemeinschaft, Leipzig, 1924.
E. Stein,
Eine Untersuchung über den Staat, 1925 (= *Jb.* VII).

EDMUND HUSSERL

"PHENOMENOLOGY"
THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE

DRAFT B
("ATTEMPT AT A SECOND DRAFT"[1])

Translated by Thomas Sheehan

[p. 256] <p. 1>

[Section i, <pp. 1–11>]

INTRODUCTION:
THE IDEA OF PHENOMENOLOGY,
AND
THE STEP BACK TO CONSCIOUSNESS

drafted by
Martin Heidegger

The universe of entities is the field from which the positive sciences of nature, history, space[2] acquire their respective areas of objects. Directed straight at entities, these sciences in their totality undertake the investigation of everything that is. So apparently there is no field of possible research left over for philosophy, which since antiquity has been considered the fundamental science.[3] But does not Greek philosophy, right from its decisive origins, precisely make "entities" its object of inquiry? Certainly it does – not, how-

---

[1] "Encycl Brit *Zum Versuch der zweiten Bearbeitung (während Heid. Anwesenheit)* und *Heid. 1–10*": in Husserl's shorthand on a cover sheet preceding the text of B2. *Hu* IX, p. 597 (and in part, p. 590).

[2] Husserl (B1, p. 1.4) glosses the words "history, space" with "spirit history."

[3] Husserl (B1, p. 1.7–8) puts square brackets around the phrase "which since antiquity has been considered the fundamental science."

ever, in order to determine this or that entity, but rather in order to understand entities *as entities*, that is to say, with regard to their being.[4] Efforts at *answering* the question "What are entities as such?" remain shaky for a long time because the *posing of the question* is itself entangled in essential obscurities.

Nonetheless, already in the first steps of the science of the being of entities something striking comes to light.[5] Philosophy seeks to clarify being[6] via a reflection on one's *thinking* about entities (Parmenides).[7] Plato's disclosure of the Ideas takes its bearings from the *soul's soliloquy (logos)* with itself.[8] The Aristotelian categories originate with regard to *reason's* assertoric knowledge. Descartes explicitly founds First Philosophy on the *res cogitans*. Kant's transcendental problematic operates in the field of *consciousness*. Is this turning of the gaze away from **<p. 2>** entities and onto consciousness something accidental, or is it demanded, in the final analysis, by the specific character of that which, under the title "being," has constantly been sought for as the problem-area of philosophy?[9]

The fundamental insight into[10] the necessity of the return to consciousness; the radical and explicit determination of the path of, and the procedural rules for, this return; the principle-based determination and systematic exploration of the field that is to be disclosed[11] in this return – this we designate as phenomenology.[12] It stands in the service of the guiding philosophical problematic, namely, the question about the being of entities in the articulated mani-

---

[4] In B1 p. 1.13 this word is underlined by hand, probably by Heidegger.

[5] Husserl (B1, p. 1.13–18) brackets the last two sentences and in the left margin substitutes the following for them: "For a long time the posing of the question, and consequently the answers, remain entangled in obscurities. Nonetheless already in the origins something striking comes to light." This latter text is taken into *Hu* IX at p. 256.12–14.

[6] Husserl (B1, p. 1.18) glosses "being" with "entities as such."

[7] Cf. Parmenides, Fragment 3: τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ ἐστίν νοεῖν τε καὶ εἶναι.

[8] See Plato, *Sophist*, 263e, where thought, διάνοια, is defined as ὁ μὲν ἐντὸς ψυχῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν διάλογος ἄνευ φωνῆς γιγνόμενος, that is, "the interior dialogue of the soul with itself, which happens without sound." See Heidegger's lecture course of 1924–1925 published as *Platon: Sophistes*, GA I, 19, edited by Ingeborg Schüßler, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1992, pp. 607–608: "es ist ein λέγειν *der Seele zu sich selbst*," p. 608.

[9] The implicit quotation here is from Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z 1, 1028 b 2ff.: καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ πάλαι τε καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ ζητούμενον καὶ ἀεὶ ἀπορούμενον, τί τὸ ὄν; τοῦτο ἐστι, τίς ἡ οὐσία; – a text that Heidegger cites in part in *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, fourth, enlarged edition, 1973, p. 239, E.T., *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, translated by Richard Taft, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1990, p. 168; and *Was ist das – die Philosophie?*, fourth edition, Pfullingen: Neske, 1966, p. 15, E.T. *What is Philosophy?* translated by Jean T. Wilde and William Kluback, New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Press, 1958, p. 53.

[10] Husserl (B1, p. 2.3–4) changes "The fundamental insight into..." to "The fundamental clarification of...." See *Hu* IX, p. 256.26.

[11] Husserl (B1, p. 2.7) changes "to be disclosed" to "is disclosed." See *Hu* IX, p. 256.30.

[12] Husserl (B1, p.2.8) changes "we designate as phenomenology" to "is called phenomenology." See *Hu* IX, p. 256.31.

fold of its kinds and levels.[13]

But for a long time now[14] has not this task of returning to consciousness been taken over and adequately fulfilled by psychology, with the result that laying a radical foundation for philosophy coincides with producing a pure psychology?[15] Nonetheless, fundamental reflection on the object and method of a pure psychology can let us see precisely[16] that such a psychology is fundamentally unable to secure[17] the foundations for philosophy as a science. For psychology itself, as a positive science, is the investigation of a determinate region of entities and thus, for its part, requires a foundation.[18]

Therefore, the return to consciousness, which every philosophy seeks with varying [degrees of] certitude and clarity, reaches back beyond the region of the pure psychic into the field of pure subjectivity. Because the being of everything that can be experienced by the subject in various ways – the transcendent in the broadest sense – is constituted in this pure subjectivity, pure subjectivity is called transcendental subjectivity. Pure psychology as a positive science of consciousness points **<p. 3>** back to the transcendental science of pure subjectivity. This latter is the realization of the idea of phenomenology as scientific philosophy. Conversely, only the transcendental science of consciousness provides full insight into the essence of pure psychology, its basic function, and the conditions of its possibility.[19]

---

[13] Husserl (B1, p. 2.8–11) brackets this sentence and in the left margin substitutes the following for it: "The ultimate clarification of the philosophical problem of being, and its methodic reduction to scientifically executed philosophical work, overcome the vague generality and emptiness of traditional **[p. 257]** philosophizing. The mode of inquiry, the methodic research and solutions, follow the classification, according to principles, of what [the attitude of] positivity straightforwardly accepts as 'entities' in all their kinds and levels." See *Hu* IX 256.31 to 257.3.

[14] Husserl (B1, p. 2.12, within the text) overwrites this phrase with "since Locke."

[15] Husserl (B1, p. 2.11–14) amends this sentence to read: "But since Locke, has not this task been taken over by psychology? Does the radical grounding of philosophy demand anything other than simply a psychology of pure conscious subjectivity, methodically and consistently restricted to inner experience?" See *Hu* IX, p. 257.4–8.

[16] Husserl (B1, p. 2.15) brackets out this word [*gerade*]. See *Hu* IX, p. 257.8.

[17] Husserl (B1, p. 2.17) changes this from "secure" [*sichern*] to "provide" [*beistellen*]. See *Hu* IX, p. 257.11.

[18] Husserl (B1, p. 2.18–20) amends this sentence to read: "For psychology is itself a positive science, and in keeping with the way any positive science does its research, psychology leaves untouched the question that concerns all these sciences equally, namely, the question about the meaning of being in the regions of being of these sciences." See *Hu* IX, p. 257.12–15.

[19] On the back of B1, p. 2 Husserl writes a long shorthand memo. It is difficult to ascertain to what passage of the typescript (if at all) it is intended to pertain. Biemel transcribes the text at *Hu* IX, p. 598–599. For a translation of the text, see below: Husserl's Shorthand Note from B1, p.2.

PART I
THE IDEA OF A PURE PSYCHOLOGY

All lived experiences in which we relate directly to objects – experiencing, thinking, willing, valuing – allow of a turn of the gaze whereby they themselves become objects. The various modes of lived experience are revealed to be that wherein everything to which we relate shows itself, that is to say,[20] "appears." For that reason the lived experiences are called phenomena. The turning of the gaze towards them, the experience and definition of the lived experiences[21] as such, is the phenomenological attitude. In **[p. 258]** this mode of expression, the word "phenomenological" is still being employed in a preliminary sense. With the turning of the gaze to the phenomena a universal task opens up, that of exploring systematically the multitudes of lived experiences, their typical forms, levels and interrelations of levels, and of understanding them as a self-contained whole. Directed towards the lived experiences, we make the "soul's" modes of comportment – the pure psychic – into our object. We call it "the pure psychic" because, in looking at the lived experiences as such, one prescinds from all psychic functions in the sense of the organization of bodiliness, which is to say, one prescinds from the psychophysical. **<p. 4>** The aforementioned phenomenological attitude provides the access to the pure psychic and makes possible the thematic investigation of it in the form of a pure psychology. Clarifying the understanding of the idea of a pure psychology requires answering three questions:

1. What counts as the object of pure psychology?
2. What mode of access and what kind of treatment does this object, given its own structure, demand?
3. What is the basic function of pure psychology?

1. The Object of Pure Psychology

How in general is one to characterize the entity that becomes the object through the phenomenological turn of gaze? In all of the psyche's pure lived experience (in the perceiving of something, in the remembering of something, in the imagining of something, in the passing of judgment about something, in the willing of something, in the enjoying of something,[22] in the hoping for something, and so forth) there is an intrinsic directedness-toward.... Lived experiences are intentional. This relating-oneself-to... is not merely added on

---

[20] In B1, p. 3.12 this phrase is crossed out in the typescript. See *Hu* IX, p. 257.33.

[21] Husserl (B1, p. 3.14) adds the word "purely" after "lived experiences." See *Hu* IX, p. 257.36.

[22] Biemel transposes this phrase from here to the position after "in the imaging of something." Compare B1, p. 4.16 and *Hu* IX, 258.26.

to the psychic subsequently and occasionally as some accidental relation, as if lived experiences could be what they are without the intentional relation. Rather, the intentionality of lived experiences shows itself to be the essential structure of the pure psychic. The whole of a complex of lived experience – that is to say, a psychic life[23] – exists at each moment as a self (an "I"), and as this self it lives factically in community with others. The purely psychic is therefore accessible both in experience of the self **[p. 259] <p. 5>** as well as in the intersubjective experience of other [*fremden*] psychic lives.

Each one of the lived experiences that manifest themselves in experience of the self has about it, in the first instance, its own essential form and the possible modes of change that belong to it. The perception of, for example, a cube has this one thing itself in the originary comprehending gaze: the *one* thing.[24] Nonetheless, as a lived experience, the perception itself[25] is not a simple empty having-present of the thing. Rather, the thing is presented in perception via multiple "modes of appearance." The interconnection of these modes, which in fact[26] constitutes the perception as a whole, has its own set of typical forms and its own typical regulation of its flow.

In the recollection of that same object,[27] of that same thing, the modes of appearance are identical [to those of the perception] and yet are modified in a way that befits a recollection. What is more, there come to light distinctions and grades of clarity and of relative determinateness and indeterminateness in the comprehension – such as those of time-perspectives, attention, and so on. Thus, for example, the judged [content] of a judgment is known sometimes as evident and other times as not evident. In turn, the non-evident judgment either can occur as something that merely happens to have struck you or it can be something explicated step by step. Correspondingly the lived experiences of willing and valuing are always unities of hidden founding "modes of appearance."

However,[28] that which is experienced in such lived experiences does not appear simply as identical and different, individual and general, as an entity or not an entity, a possible and probable entity, as useful, beautiful, or good; rather, it is *confirmed* as true or untrue, genuine or not genuine. But the essen-

---

[23] In B1 p. 4.23 the phrase "that is to say" [*das heißt*] is crossed out. In *Hu* IX, p. 258.34 the phrase is changed, without apparent manuscript evidence, to read: "Das Ganze eines Erlebniszusammenhangs, eines seelischen Lebens existiert..." ("The whole of a complex of lived experience, of a psychic life...").

[24] In B1, p. 5.5–6 "the *one* thing" is crossed out, and the earlier word "one" is underlined. See *Hu* IX, p. 259.5–6.

[25] Heidegger (B1, p. 5.6, calligraphy) crosses out this word in his original text and substitutes "**for its part**." See *Hu* IX, p. 259.6.

[26] Heidegger (B1, p. 5.9, calligraphy) writes in the word "**alone**." See *Hu* IX, p. 259.10.

[27] The phrase "that same object" is crossed out in B1, p. 5.12 [cf. *Hu* IX, p. 259.12]. The reference is to the cube mentioned above.

[28] Heidegger (B1, p. 5.21, calligraphy) changes this to "**Nonetheless**." See *Hu* IX, p. 259.22.

tial forms of individual lived experiences are embedded in typical forms of possible syntheses and flows within **<p. 6>** a closed psychical nexus. The essential form of this[29] [nexus], as a totality, is that of the psychic life of an individual self as such. This self exists on the basis of its abiding convictions, decisions, habits, and character-traits. And this whole of the self's habituality manifests in turn the essential forms of its genesis and of its current possible activity, which for its part remains embedded in the associative matrices whose specific form of happening is one with that activity throughout typical relations of change.

Factically the self always lives in community with others. Social acts (such as appealing to other persons, making an agreement **[p. 260]** with them, dominating their will, and so on) not only have about them their own proper form as the lived experiences of groups, families, corporate bodies, and societies, but also have a typical form of the way they happen, of the way they effect things (power and powerlessness), of their development and progression. Intrinsically and thoroughly structured as intentional, this totality of life of individuals in possible communities makes up the whole field of the pure psychic. By what means does one achieve secure access to this region, and what kind of disclosure is appropriate to it?

2. The Method of Pure Psychology

The essential components of the method are determined by the basic structure and kind of being of the object. If the pure psychic is essentially intentional and initially accessible in one's experience of one's individual self, the phenomenological turn of the gaze onto lived experiences must be carried out in such a way that these lived experiences are shown in their intentionality and become comprehensible in[30] their formal types. Access to entities that are, by their basic structure, intentional is carried out **<p. 7>** by way of the phenomenological-psychological reduction. Remaining within the reductive attitude, one carries out the eidetic analysis of the pure psychic, that is to say, one lays out the essential structures of particular kinds of lived experience, their forms of interrelation and occurrence. Inasmuch as the psychic becomes accessible both in experience of the self and in intersubjective experience, the reduction is correspondingly divided into the egological and the intersubjective reductions.

---

[29] Heidegger (B1, 6.1, calligraphy) substitutes "*Er*" for "*Dieser.*"

[30] Heidegger (B1, p. 6.26, calligraphy) subsequently changes "in" to "**with regard to.**" See *Hu* IX, p. 260.16.

a) The Phenomenological[31] Reduction

The turning of the gaze away from the non-reflective perception of, for example, a thing in nature [*Naturdinges*] and onto this very act of perceiving has a special characteristic: in it the direction of the comprehending act, which was previously directed at the thing, is *pulled back* from the non-reflective perception in order to be directed at the act of perceiving as such. This leading-back (reduction) of the direction of the comprehending act from the perception, and the shifting of the comprehending **[p. 261]** onto the act of perceiving, changes almost nothing in the perception; indeed, the reduction actually renders the perception accessible as what it is, namely, as perception *of* the thing. Of course, the physical thing in nature, by reason of its very essence, is itself never a possible object of a psychological reflection. Nevertheless, it shows up in the reducing gaze that focuses on the act of perceiving, because this perceiving is essentially a perceiving *of* the thing. The thing *belongs* to the perceiving *as its perceived.* The perceiving's intentional relation is certainly not some free-floating relation directed into the void; rather, as *intentio* it has an *intentum* that belongs to it essentially. Whether or not what-is-perceived in the perception is itself in truth[32] present at hand, **<p. 8>** the perception's intentional act-of-meaning [*Vermeinen*], in keeping with its own tendency to grasp something, is nonetheless directed to the entity as bodily present. Any perceptual illusion makes this plain. Only because the perceiving[33] essentially has its *intentum*, can it be modified into a deception *about* something.

Through the performance of the reduction the full intentional make-up of a lived experience becomes visible for the first time. But because *all* pure lived experiences and their *interrelations* are structured intentionally, the reduction guarantees universal access to the pure psychic, that is to say, to the *phenomena*. For this reason the reduction is called "phenomenological." However, that which first of all becomes accessible in the performance of the phenome-

---

[31] Heidegger (B1, p. 7.9, calligraphy) subsequently amends this by inserting "**-psychological**" here, so as to read:

"The Phenomenological-psychological Reduction."

See *Hu* IX, p. 260.26–27. In 1925 Heidegger called this reduction "the first stage within the process of *phenomenological reductions*" [note the plural] and referred to it as "the so-called *transcendental reduction.*" See his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, GA II, 20, edited by Petra Jaeger, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1979, p. 137; E.T. *History of the Concept of Time*, translated by Theodore Kisiel, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985, p. 100.

[32] Heidegger (B1, p. 7.26, calligraphy) subsequently substitutes "**truly**" (*wahrhaft*) for "in truth." See *Hu* IX, p. 261.12.

[33] After "perceiving" Heidegger (B1, p. 7.4, calligraphy) inserts

"as intentional"

See *Hu* IX, p. 261.16–17.

nological reduction is the pure psychic as a *factical, unrepeatable* set of experiences of one *here-and-now* self. But over and above the descriptive characterization of this momentary and unrepeatable stream of lived experience, is a genuine, scientific – that is, objectively valid – knowledge of the psychic possible?

b) The Eidetic Analysis[34]

If intentionality makes up the basic structure of all pure lived experiences and varies according to individual kinds of such experience, then there arises the possible and necessary task of spelling out what pertains to, for example, a perception in general, a wish in general, in each instance according to the make-up of its full intentional structure. Therefore **[p. 262]** the attitude of reduction to the pure psychic that initially shows up as an individual factical set of experiences must prescind from all psychic facticity. This facticity serves only exemplarily as a basis for the free variation of possibilities.

Thus, for instance, the phenomenological analysis of the perception of **<p. 9>** spatial things is in no way a report on perceptions that occur factically or that are to be expected empirically. Rather, a phenomenological analysis means laying out the necessary structural system without which a synthesis of manifold perceptions, as perception of one and the same thing, could not be thought. Accordingly, the exhibiting of the psychic, carried out in the reductive attitude, aims at the *invariant* – the necessary typical form (*eidos*) of the lived experience – which comes out in the variations. The attitude of reduction to the psychic, therefore, functions in the manner of an *eidetic* analysis of phenomena. The scientific exploration of the pure psychic, pure psychology, can be realized only as *reductive-eidetic* – that is,[35] as phenomenological – psychology. Phenomenological psychology is *descriptive*, which means that the essential structures of the psychic are read off from the psychic directly.[36] All phenomenological concepts and propositions require direct demonstration upon the phenomena themselves.

Inasmuch as the reduction, as we have characterized it, mediates access only to the psychic life that is always one's own, it is called the *egological* reduction. Nevertheless, because every self stands in a nexus of empathy with others, and because this nexus is constituted in intersubjective lived experiences, the egological reduction requires a necessary expansion by means of the

---

[34] On May 29, 1925, in his course *Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, Heidegger referred to this as the eidetic *reduction* rather than eidetic analysis. See *GA* vol. 20, p. 137; *History of the Concept of Time*, p. 100.

[35] Heidegger (B1, p. 9.12) crosses out this phrase.

[36] Husserl (B1, p. 9.14) changes "directly" to "directly-and-intuitively via the method of variation." Cf. *Hu* IX, p. 262.21.

intersubjective reduction. The phenomenology of *empathy* that is to be treated within the framework of the intersubjective reduction leads – by clarifying how the phenomena of empathy within my pure psychic nexus can unfold in mutually felt confirmation[37] – to more than the description of this type of syntheses as syntheses of my own psyche. What is confirmed here, in a peculiar form of evidence, is the *co-existence* [*Mitdasein*] of a concrete subjectivity,[38] **<p. 10>** indicated consistently and with ever new determining content – co-present with a bodiliness that is experienced originally and harmoniously in my own sphere of consciousness; and [yet], on the other hand, not present for me *originaliter* **[p. 263]** the way my own subjectivity is [present] in its original relation to *my* corporeality.[39] The carrying out of the phenomenological reduction in my actual and possible acceptance of a "foreign" subjectivity in the evidential form of mutually felt empathy is the intersubjective reduction, in which, on the underlying basis of the reduction to my pure and concrete subjectivity, the foreign subjectivities that are originally confirmed in it,[40] come to be accepted *as pure*, along, with in further sequence, their pure psychic connections.[41]

3. The Basic Function of Pure Psychology

The reduction opens the way to the pure psychic as such. The eidetic analysis discloses the essential interrelations of what has become accessible in the reduction.[42] Consequently in the reductive eidetic investigation of the pure psychic there emerge the determinations that belong to the pure psychic as such, that is to say, the basic concepts of psychology, insofar as psychology, as an empirical science of the psychophysical whole of the concrete human

---

[37] Husserl (B1, p. 9.24) notes: "intersubjective reduction."

[38] Heidegger (B1, p. 9.28, calligraphy) changes "subjectivity" to "**other self**," so as to read:

> **"to a concrete other self."**

See *Hu* IX, p. 262.37.

[39] Heidegger (B1, p. 10.2–4, calligraphy; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 262.39 to 263.1) subsequently changed the clause after the semicolon to read:

> **"But on the other hand this other [*fremde*] self is not present *originaliter* the way one's own [self] is in its original relation to *its* bodiliness."**

[40] The reference of "it" (*sie*) seems to be "my pure and concrete subjectivity" at B1, p. 10.8–9, although it could refer back to "intersubjective reduction" at B1, p. 10.7–8.

[41] Heidegger (B1, p. 10.8–11, calligraphy; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 263.5–8) subsequently changed this to read as follows (the last word, "it," seems to refer to "the intersubjective reduction"):

> **"The carrying out of the phenomenological reduction in my actual and possible acceptance of a 'foreign' psychic life in the evidential form of mutually felt sympathy is the intersubjective reduction. On the basis of the egological reduction the intersubjective reduction renders accessible the foreign psychic life originally confirmed in it."**

[42] Heidegger (B1, p. 10.15, calligraphy; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 263.11–13) adds:

being, has its central region in pure psychic life as such.

Pure psychology furnishes the necessary *a priori* foundation for empirical psychology in relation to the pure psychic. Just as the grounding of an "exact" empirical science of nature requires a systematic disclosure of the essential forms of nature in general, without which it is impossible to think nature at all and, more specifically, to think spatial and temporal form, movement, change, physical substantiality and causality – so too a scientifically **<p. 11>** "exact" psychology requires a disclosure of the *a priori* typical forms without which it is impossible to think the I (or the we), consciousness, the objects of consciousness,[43] and hence any psychic life at all, along with all the distinctions and essentially possible forms of syntheses that are inseparable from the idea of an individual and communal psychic whole. Although the psychophysical nexus as such has its own proper *a priori* that is not yet determined by the basic concepts of pure psychology, nonetheless this psychophysical *a priori* requires a fundamental orientation to the *a priori* of the pure psychic.[44]

"The former is the *necessary* component – the latter along with the former is the *sufficient* component – of the phenomenological method of pure psychology."

[43] "*Bewusstseinsgegenständlichkeit*" – perhaps "the objectivity of consciousness."

[44] Husserl (B1, 11.9–10) adds: "and yet founded on what is intrinsically prior [*an sich...früheren*]."

[p. 264] <p. 12="p.1">

PART II
PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY

drafted by
Edmund Husserl

[Section ii-a][45]

[The Historical Intertwining of Phenomenological and Transcendental Phenomenology, and the Need to Distinguish the Two]

The idea of pure psychology did not grow out of psychology's own needs to fulfill the conditions essential to its systematic construction. Rather, the history of pure psychology takes us back to John Locke's famous and foundational work, and back to David Hume's noteworthy elaboration of the tendencies that stem from Locke. Hume's brilliant *Treatise* already has the form of a rigorous and systematic structural exploration of the sphere of pure lived experience. Thus in a certain sense it [is[46]] the first attempt at a "phenomenology."

But here in the beginning, the restriction [of the investigation] to the realm of the pure subjective was determined by interests coming from outside psychology. Psychology was at the service of the problematic of "understanding" or "reason" that Descartes had reawakened[47] in a new form – namely, the fact that entities in the true sense are known to be such only via these subjective faculties. In our current way of speaking, it was a matter of "transcendental

---

[45] In B2, pp. 12–14 = "pp. 1–3." (The original page numeration is always given in quotation marks.) This equals *Hu* IX, pp. 264.1–266.15. The material of Section ii-a, which is continued in Section ii-b, generally corresponds to the topics treated in Draft D, Part II, §6, from which we take the title that immediately follows. Husserl put no paragraph breaks in Section ii-a. I have added those that appear below.

[46] The bracketed word is added by Biemel, *Hu* IX, 264.8.

[47] Within the text of B1, p. 12.12 Husserl here adds in shorthand "and raised to a new level of consciousness" ["*und auf eine neue Stufe des Bewusstseins erhobenen*"]. The addition is taken over into Draft C (typed p. 3, hand-numbered p. 14, although the page is actually found in B1; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 610). However, the sentence was radically edited in Draft C to read: "Psychology stood in the service of the transcendental problem awakened by Descartes." In that form it entered the D draft at *Hu* IX, p. 287.13–14. These changes – made in B1 but not in B2, included in some but not all the C drafts, and yet taken into the D draft – show the fluidity that existed between drafts B, C, and D between mid-October and December 8, 1927.

philosophy."[48] Descartes put in doubt the general possibility that any knowledge could legitimately transcend the knowing subject. That, in turn, made it impossible to understand the genuine ontological sense[49] of any entity *qua* objective reality, insofar as its existence is intended and demonstrated only by way of subjective experiences. The "transcendent" world, which, from a naïve point of view, is given as existing, becomes problematic from a "transcendental" point of view: it cannot serve as a basis for cognition the way it does in the positive sciences. According to Descartes, such a basis requires that we get a pure grasp of that which is presupposed in the transcendental inquiry and which is itself beyond question: the *ego cogito*. Descartes' *Meditations* already gained the insight that everything real – ultimately this whole world – has being for us only in terms **<p. 13="p. 2">** of our experience and cognition, and that even the performances of reason, aimed at objective truth with the character of "evidence," unfold purely within subjectivity.[50] For all its primitiveness, Descartes' methodical attempt at universal doubt is the first radical method of reduction to pure subjectivity.

It was Locke, however, who first saw in all of this a broad area of concrete **[p. 265]** tasks and began to work on it. Because rational cognition in general occurs only in cognitive subjectivity, the only way to get a transcendental clarification of the transcendental validity of cognition is by way of a systematic study of all levels of cognitive experiences, activities, and faculties exactly as these present themselves in pure "inner experience" – a study that was guided, however, by the naïvely developed basic concepts of the experiential world and their logical elaboration. What is required, in short, is inner-directed descriptions and the exploration of pure psychological genesis.[51]

---

[48] Heidegger changes this (B1, p. 12.14–15, calligraphy) to:

"The tendency was towards a 'transcendental philosophy.'"

Husserl takes this change over into the C drafts but not into the D draft. Moreover, in B1 Heidegger recommends that Husserl insert here the sentence that appears three sentences below (B1, p. 12.26–13.3) and that runs from "Descartes' *Meditations* already [Heidegger recommends dropping "already"] gained the insight..." to "...unfold purely within subjectivity." Husserl followed the suggestion (along with making editorial changes in the sentence) in C (cf. *Hu* IX, p. 610.12–16) and carried the result over into D (p. 12 = *Hu* IX, p. 287.14–19). [This present note corrects *Hu* IX, p. 600.5, "bis ?": it should read: "bis 264.33."]

[49] Phrases like "*Seinssinn*" or "*Seinsgeltung*" are translated as "ontological sense" or "ontological validity."

[50] Heidegger suggests (B1, p. 12.26) that this sentence (minus the "already") be located above. See footnote 49.

[51] Apparently Heidegger suggests (B1, p. 13.12–15, calligraphy) dropping this sentence and changing the preceding two sentences to read:

"...a transcendental clarification of cognition's transcendental validity can [proceed] only as a systematic study of all levels of cognitive experiences, activities, and faculties exactly as these present themselves in pure 'inner experience' and announce their pure [Heidegger later erases 'pure'] psychic genesis. Naturally the most accessible clue for this study was provided by the naïvely developed basic concepts of the experiential world and by their logical elaboration."

Husserl takes over this suggestion in C (*Hu* IX, p. 610.36–37) but drops it in D (*ibid.*, p. 287).

But Locke did not know how to sustain this momentous idea at the high level of the principles that characterize Descartes' inquiry. With Locke the methodically reduced Cartesian ego – the ego that would remain in being even if the experiential world did not – once again becomes the ordinary ego, the human psyche in the world. Although Locke certainly wanted to solve the transcendental questions of cognition, they get transformed in his work into psychological questions about how human beings living in the world attain and justify knowledge of the world that exists outside the mind. In this way Locke fell into transcendental psychologism, which then got passed down through the centuries (although Hume knew how to avoid it). The contradiction consists in this: Locke pursues the transcendental exploration of cognition as a psychological (in the natural positive sense of that word) exploration of cognition, thereby constantly presupposing the ontological validity of the experiential **<p. 14="p. 3">** world – whereas that very world, along with all the positive cognition that can relate to it, is what is transcendentally problematic in its ontological sense and validity. Locke confuses two things: (1) questions about natural legitimacy in the realm of positivity (that[52] of all the positive sciences), where the experiential world is the general and unquestioned presupposition, and (2) the question of transcendental legitimacy,[53] where what is put into question is the world itself – everything that has the sense of "being-in-itself" over against cognition – and where we ask in the most radical way not whether something is valid but rather what sense and import such validity can have. With that, all questions about cognition within the realm of positivity (that[54] of all the positive sciences) are burdened from the outset with the transcendental question about sense.

Nevertheless, the historical insurmountability of Locke's psychologism points back to a deeply rooted **[p. 266]** sense of truth that can be utilized in the transcendental project, a sense of truth that, despite the contradiction in [Locke's] transcendental claim, necessarily belongs to every carefully carried out part of a pure psychology of knowledge and reason. Moreover, as transcendental phenomenology (whose proper idea we are striving for) makes clear for the first time, the reverse is equally true: every correctly (hence,

---

[52] This word, "*die*," instead of referring to "positivity," could be in the plural ("those") and could refer to "questions of natural legitimacy" (*natürlichen Rechtsfragen*).

[53] Heidegger (B1, p. 14.7, calligraphy) suggests ending this sentence here and changing the remainder of the sentence, and the next sentence, to:

> **"Here the world itself – that is, every entity with the characteristic of 'in-itself-ness' with regard to cognition – is put into question. We ask not whether something 'is valid' but rather what sense and, in keeping with this sense, what import such a validity can have. The transcendental question of sense weighs upon the positive sciences."**

Husserl does not take this into C.

[54] This word, "*die*," could be in the plural ("those") and could refer to "questions about cognition" (*Erkenntnisfrage*).

concretely) realized part of a genuine transcendental theory of knowledge contains a sense of truth that can be utilized in psychology. On the one hand, every genuine and pure psychology of knowledge (even though it is not itself a transcendental theory) can be "changed over" into a transcendental [theory of knowledge]. And on the other hand, every genuine transcendental theory of knowledge (even though it is not itself a psychology)[55] can be changed over into a pure psychology of knowledge. This holds on both sides, proposition for proposition.

[Section ii-b][56]

[The Historical Intertwining of Phenomenological and Transcendental Phenomenology, and the Need to Distinguish the Two (concluded)]

<p. 15="p. 4"> In the beginning such insights were unavailable. People were not prepared to grasp the profound meaning of Descartes' radicalism in exhibiting the pure *ego cogito*, nor to draw out its consequences with strict consistency. One was unable to distinguish the attitudes of positive research from those of transcendental research and, as a result, one could not delimit the proper sense of positive science. And given the ardent efforts to create a scientific psychology that could compete in fruitfulness and rigor with the pace-setting natural sciences, people failed to radically think through the requirements of such a psychology.

In this situation, which entrapped later thinkers too, neither transcendental philosophy nor psychology was able to attain the "sure path of a science" – a rigorous science fashioned originally from the sources of experience peculiar to it – nor could the ambiguous interpenetration [of transcendental philosophy and psychology] be clarified. The psychologism of the empiricists had the advantage to the degree that it ignored the objections of the anti-psychologists and followed the evidence that any science which questions cognition in all its forms can get answers only by systematically studying these forms via direct "inner" intuition. The knowledge thus acquired about the essence of cognition could not go astray if only it questioned **[p. 267]** the ontological sense of the

---

[55] Heidegger (B1, p. 14.27–28, calligraphy) suggests that the remainder of the sentence read:

"...allows of being changed over into a *pure* psychology of knowledge."

[56] In B1 and 2, pp. 15–20 = "p. 4–9" = *Hu* IX, p. 266.16 to 270.39. The material of Section ii-b, which continues that of Section ii-a, generally corresponds to the topics treated in Draft D, Part II, §6, from which we take the title below. There is only one paragraph break in Husserl's text of Section ii-b, at *Hu* IX, p. 270.7 ("Of course one very quickly recognized...."). I have added the others that appear below.

objective world, that is, if it followed Descartes' shift of focus and his reduction to the pure ego. The charge that this was psychologism had no real effect because the anti-psychologists, out of fear of succumbing to psychologism, avoided any systematically **<p. 16="p. 5">** concrete study of cognition; and, as they reacted ever more vociferously against the increasing power of empiricism in the last century, they finally fell into an empty aporetics and dialectics that managed to get what meager sense it had only by secretly borrowing it from intuition.

Even though much valuable preparatory work towards a pure psychology can be found in Locke's *Essay* and in the related epistemological and psychological literature of the ensuing years, nevertheless pure psychology itself still attained no real foundation. For one thing, its essential meaning as what we might call "first psychology" – the eidetic science of the *logos* (?)[57] of the psychic – remained hidden, and thus the genuine guiding idea for systematic work [on it] was lacking. For another thing, the great efforts of individual psychological investigations, whether concerned with the transcendental or not, could bear no real fruit so long as naturalism, which dominated everything, remained blind to intentionality – the essential characteristic of the psychic sphere – and therefore blind to the infinite breadth of the pure psychological problematic and methodology that belong to intentionality.

Pure psychology, in the fundamental sense sketched out in Part I, arose from outside general psychology; specifically, it blossomed as the final fruit of a methodologically new development of transcendental philosophy, in which it became a rigorously systematic science constructed concretely from below. But of course pure psychology arose not as the goal of transcendental philosophy or as a discipline belonging to it, but rather as a result of the fact that the relations between positivity and transcendentality were finally clarified. This clarification made possible for the first time a principled solution to the problem of psychologism; and following from that, **<p. 17="p. 6">** the methodological reform of philosophy into rigorous science was concluded and philosophy was freed from the persistent hindrances of inherited confusion.

The prior event that made this development possible was Brentano's great discovery: his transformation of the scholastic concept **[p. 268]** of intentionality into an essential characteristic of "mental phenomena" as phenomena of "inner perception." In general, Brentano's psychology and philosophy have had an historical impact on the rise of phenomenology but no influence at all on its content. Brentano himself was still caught in the prevailing naturalistic misunderstanding of conscious life, and into that orbit he drew those "mental phenomena." He was unable to grasp the true sense of a descriptive and genetic disclosure of intentionality. His work lacked a conscious utilization of

[57] This question mark appears typed in the B drafts at this point (B2, p. 16="5.11").

the method of "phenomenological reduction" and consequently a correct and steady consideration of the *cogitata qua cogitata*. The idea of a phenomenologically pure psychology in the sense just described remained foreign to him. Equally foreign to him was the true meaning of transcendental philosophy, indeed the necessity of a basic eidetic transcendental discipline related to transcendental subjectivity. Essentially determined by the British empiricists, Brentano in his philosophical orientation took up the demand for a grounding of all specifically psychological disciplines (including transcendental philosophy) on a psychology that would be [constructed] purely out of inner experience but that, in keeping with his discovery, would have to be a psychology of intentionalities. As with all empiricists, Brentano's psychology was, and ever remained, a positive and empirical science of human psychic being.

<p. 18="p. 7"> Brentano never understood the fundamental charge [laid against him] of psychologism, any more than he understood the profound sense of Descartes' first *Meditations*, where both the radical method of access to the transcendental sphere and the transcendental problem itself were already discovered in a first, if primitive, form. Brentano did not appropriate the insight (which emerged already in Descartes) into the antithesis between positive and transcendental science and into the necessity of an absolute transcendental grounding of positive science, without which it cannot be science in the highest sense.

There is another limitation to Brentano's research. It is true that, as with the old, moderate empiricism of a Locke, Brentano did stimulate various *a priori* disciplines, although without clarifying their deeper sense as inquiries into essence. However, grounded in the positivity that he never **[p. 269]** overcame, he did not recognize the universal necessity of *a priori* research in *all* ontological spheres if rigorous science is to be possible. For precisely that reason he also failed to recognize the fundamental necessity of a systematic science of the essence of pure subjectivity.

The phenomenology that grew out of[58] Brentano was motivated not by psychological interests and not at all by positive-scientific ones, but purely by transcendental concerns. In our critique of Brentano we have indicated the motives which determined the development of his phenomenology. In that regard it is always to be remarked that he continued to be determined by a traditional motive of Lockean-Humean philosophy, namely, that regardless of its orientation, every theory of reason, cognitive or otherwise, had to be derived from inner experience of the corresponding phenomena.

Thus, the major points are: the disclosure of the genuine sense-content and method of intentionality; disclosure of the deepest motives and the horizon of

---

[58] The literal meaning is "that is connected with" (*anknüpfende*); but it is clear that Husserl is referring here to his own phenomenology, which was connected with, but grew away from, Brentano's work.

Descartes' intuitions [*Intuitionen*], **<p. 19="p. 8">** culminating in the method of "transcendental reduction," first of all as egological and then as intersubjective. By such means one lays out the transcendental field as the arena of such transcendental experience. I may also mention the separation between positivity and transcendentality, as well as the systematic unfolding of the fundamental content of positivity under the rubric of an *universitas* of rigorous positive sciences, merged with the complete science of the given world and related to the *universitas* of the underlying *a priori* disciplines, themselves merged with the unity of a universal positive ontology. Furthermore there is the comprehension of the concrete totality of transcendental questions posed by the positivity of all these sciences; the knowledge that transcendental philosophy in its primary sense is a science of essence related to the field of transcendental possible experience; further, the fact that on this ground a universal descriptive science and then a genetic science must be established purely from out of possible experience (in the eidetic sense), which is the source of all transcendental questions relative to the particular sciences and then to all forms of social culture as well. At the beginning of this development, **[p. 270]** stimuli from Leibniz' philosophy, mediated by Lotze and Bolzano, played a role with regard to the pure exhibition of *a priori* "ontologies." The first studies made were the intentional analyses connected with the production of a "formal ontology" (pure logic as mathesis universalis, along with pure logical grammar).[59]

Of course one[60] very quickly recognized the proper realm of *a priori* **<p. 20="p. 9">** psychology and the necessity of positively developing it. Nevertheless that faded for a while in the interests of exploring the intentional structures of the transcendental field, and thus in general all the work remained purely philosophical work carried out within a rigorous transcendental reduction. Only very late did one[61] come to see that in the return (which is possible at any time) from the transcendental attitude to the natural attitude, the whole of transcendental cognition within the transcendental field of intuition changes into pure psychological (eidetic) cognition within the field of psychic positivity, both individual and interpersonal. That very insight led to a pedagogical idea about how to introduce people to phenomenology given all the difficulties related to its unaccustomed transcendental attitude. Essentially every philosophy has to start with the attitude of positivity and only [subsequently], by motivations far removed from natural life, clarify the

---

[59] Husserl is referring to his *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–01). The topic of pure logical grammar is treated there in vol. II, Investigation IV, pp. 286–321 (1984 ed., pp. 301–351), E.T. vol II, 491–529. The idea of pure logic as a formal ontology or mathesis universalis is sketched out in vol. I, pp. 228–257 (1975 ed., pp. 230–258), E.T. vol. I, pp. 225–247.

[60] Husserl is referring to himself.

[61] Husserl is again referring to himself.

meaning and necessity of the transcendental attitude and research; therefore, the systematic development of pure psychology as a positive science can serve in the first instance as a pedagogical propaedeutic.

The new method of intentionality as such and the immense system of tasks that go with subjectivity as such offer extraordinary difficulties, which can be overcome at first without touching on the transcendental problem. But this totality of scientific doctrines grounded in positivity then acquires transcendental sense through the specific method of transcendental phenomenological reduction, which elevates the whole [realm of] positivity to the philosophical level. This was the very method we followed when we dealt with phenomenology as pure psychology in Part I, thereby giving phenomenology a pedagogically lower, and not yet fully genuine, sense.

[Section iii][62]

[The Transcendental Problem][63]

[p. 271] <p. 21="p. 10">[64]

The issue of all-inclusiveness belongs to the essential sense of the transcendental problem.[65] Each and every entity, the whole world that we talk about straightforwardly and that is the constant field (pre-given as self-evidently real) of all our theoretical and practical activities – all of that suddenly becomes unintelligible.[66] Every sense it has for us, whether unconditionally universal or applicable case by case to individuals, is, as we then see, a meaning that occurs in the immanence[67] of our own perceiving, representing,

---

[62] In Draft B, pp. 21–28 = "pp. 10–17" = *Hu* IX, pp. 271.1–277.21. The material of Section iii generally corresponds to the topics treated in Draft D, Part II, §§7–10.

[63] *Hu* IX, p. 271.1–26. We supply this title from Draft D, II, §7, to which its contents correspond.

[64] At the top of p. 21 in B3 Husserl writes: "Duplicate. The new text [that was prepared] for Heidegger 21–28 with Heidegger's critical notes." These pages in B3 are the ones Heidegger took from Freiburg to Messkirch on Thursday, October 20, 1927, for the purpose of correcting and commenting upon them, and it is to these pages that Heidegger refers in his letter of October 22, 1927.

[65] The German word that we translate as "all-inclusiveness" is "Universalität." As the text below shows (*Hu* IX, p. 273.31; ms. p. 24 = "p.13"), this "universality" refers to the all-encompassing breadth of the transcendental epoché.

[66] Following on Heidegger's criticisms (see below in this same paragraph), Husserl changes this sentence in B3 and B1 to read: "As soon as one's theoretical concern turns toward the life of consciousness in which each and every thing that is real for us is always 'present,' a cloud of unintelligibility spreads over the whole world, this world that we talk about straightforwardly and that is the constant field – pre-given as self-evidently real – of all our theoretical and practical activities." This latter reading is reproduced in *Hu* IX, p. 217.2–8.

[67] Heidegger's note (B3, p. 21.7; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 271, n. 1, where Biemel fails to underscore "Aufgabe"):

"It is the *task* of transcendental philosophy to show this, and that point as such must be made directly here."

Disposition of the note:

thinking, evaluating (and so on) life and that takes shape in subjective genesis; every acceptance of being is carried out within ourselves, all experiential or theoretical evidence grounding that acceptance is active within us and habitually motivates us onward. This applies to the world in each of the determinations [we make about it], including the taken-for-granted determination that what belongs to the world is "in and for itself" just the way it is, regardless of whether or not I or anyone else happen to take cognizance of it. If we vary[68] the factical world into any world that can be thought, we also undeniably vary the world's relativity to conscious subjectivity. Thus the notion of a world existing in itself is unintelligible, due to that world's essential relativity to consciousness. An equal [degree of] unintelligibility – and this too belongs to the transcendental question – is offered by any ideal "world," such as, for example, the world of numbers, which, in its own way, does exist "in itself."[69]

---

(1) Husserl copied this note in shorthand into the corresponding margin of B1 and, in that text, changed the word "Immanenz," to which Heidegger's note is keyed, to "Innerlichkeit" (see *Hu* IX, p. 271.10–11).

(2) In *Hu* IX, p. 271, n. 1 Heidegger's marginal note given above is incorrectly keyed to the word "Variieren" at *Hu* IX, p. 271.19, whereas it should be keyed to *Hu* IX, p. 271.11. See the following footnote.

[68] Heidegger (B3, p. 21.13) inserts a red "T" at the beginning of this sentence so as to call into question the discussion of "unintelligibility" that follows (as well as in the second sentence of this paragraph). This mark directs Husserl's attention to Appendix II, first point: Heidegger's letter of October 22, 1927:

> **The *first* thing in the presentation of the transcendental problem is to clarify what the "unintelligibility" of entities means.**
> - **In what respect are entities unintelligible? i.e., what higher claim of intelligibility is possible and necessary.**
> - **By a return to what is this intelligibility achieved?**

Disposition of the note:

(1) The fact that Husserl understood Heidegger's red mark to refer to the Appendices is indicated by Husserl's own marginal note – *"Beilage"* ("Appendix") – written in the left margins of both B3 and B1.

(2) Biemel wrongly states that this appendix has not been retained ["(nicht erhalten)": *Hu* IX, p. 603] and then wrongly relates Heidegger's red mark here to Heidegger's previous marginal note seven lines earlier ("It is the task of transcendental philosophy..."; cf. the previous footnote).

(3) The fact that Husserl understood that Heidegger was criticizing the notion of "unintelligibility" is shown by the fact that in B3 and B1 Husserl (a) crossed out the two sentences that begin "Thus the notion of a world existing in itself is unintelligible..." and "An equal [degree of] unintelligibility..." (*Hu* IX, p. 271.21–26), and (b) changed part of the related second sentence of the paragraph: "Each and every entity..." (B3, p. 21.2–5, corresponding to *Hu* IX, p. 271.2–8: see above).

(4) Biemel's editing here is paradoxical. (a) At *Hu* IX, p. 271.21–26, he retains the two sentences that Husserl crosses out, whereas (b) at *Hu* IX, p. 271.2–8 he substitutes the revised text of Husserl.

[69] Husserl (B1 and B3, left margins) writes a second time: *"Beilage"* ("Appendix"), which Biemel again incorrectly says is "not retained" (*Hu* IX, p. 603). As mentioned above, the present sentence and the previous one are crossed out in B1 and B3.

[Psychologism as a False Solution][70]

Our elaboration[71] of the idea of a phenomenologically pure psychology has shown the possibility of disclosing, via a systematic phenomenological reduction, the proper essential character of psychic subjects in eidetic universality and in all their possible forms. The same goes for those forms of reason that ground and confirm legitimacy, and consequently for all the forms of worlds that appear in consciousness and show themselves as existing "in themselves." Although this phenomenological-eidetic psychology is not an empirical psychology of the factical human being, nonetheless it now seems called upon **<p. 22="p. 11">** to clarify concretely, and down to the last detail, the ontological sense of world as such. **[p. 272]** However, if we closely analyze the phenomenological-psychological reduction and the pure psyches and communities of psyches that are its outcome,[72] clearly only the following is entailed in the procedure:[73] that for the purpose of exhibiting psychic subjectivity as a field of pure inner experience and judgment, the psychologist must "put out of play" for all psyches the world they accept as existing. In making phenomenological judgments, the psychologist must refrain from any belief regarding the world. For example, when I as a psychologist describe my own perception as a pure psychic event, I am not permitted to make direct judgments about the perceived thing the way a natural scientist does. Rather, I am permitted to judge only about my "perceived as such" as that which is an inseparable moment of the lived experience of perceiving: namely, as an appearance with this given sense, known as the selfsame, believed in as existing, and the like, amidst whatever changes in its modes of appearance. And so on in every case.[74] Thus,[75] when I make a general and (as is required) a rigorously consistent

---

[70] *Hu* IX, pp. 271.26–273.13. The contents of this section correspond generally to Draft D, II. §8, "Psychologism's Solution as a Transcendental Circle."

[71] **(1)** In editing Draft B, Husserl cut page 21 of B3 in half and placed the bottom half (lines 19 to 28 = *Hu* IX, 271.24 [*mitgehörig*] to 271.36 [*berufen*]) in B1 at this point. **(2)** In the transition from Draft B to C, this sentence and some of what follows carries over to C p. 19.18 ff. **(3)** In the transition from Draft C to D, p. 19 of C gets inserted into D and renumbered as p. 18. There the present sentence begins §8 (*Hu* IX, p. 290.11).

[72] Reading "*sich ergebenden*" instead of the manuscripts' "*sie ergebenden*" at B (all drafts) p. 22.2–3 and *Hu* IX, p. 272.2.

[73] Heidegger (B3, p. 22.4–16; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 603, re 272.4–16) marks off the rest of this sentence as well as the following three sentences – i.e., from "that for the purpose" to "And so on in every case" – and notes in the margin:

"These lines should be put [above] in section I-a to fill out my altogether too brief presentation of the reduction."

By "Ia" Heidegger is referring to section I.2.a of his own draft (B1, p. 7.9; = *Hu* IX, p. 260.27), the section originally entitled "The Phenomenological Reduction."

[74] For the next two sentences I follow Husserl's original version in B2, p. 22.16–25 (the unmarked typescript).

[75] Heidegger (B3, p. 22.16–23; see *Hu* IX, p. 604, re 274.17–23) edits this and the next sentence to read:

reduction to my psyche, the world that has been rendered questionable in the transcendental inquiry is certainly no longer presupposed – and the same for all psyches as regards their purity. Here in this context of statements about the purely psychic, the world that has straightforward validity for these minds themselves is not the focus of attention, but rather only the pure being and life of the very psyches in which the world appears and naturally, via the corresponding subjective modes of appearance and belief, acquires meaning and validity.

Nonetheless, it is still a question of "psyches" and connections between them, psyches belonging to bodies that are always presupposed and that are only temporarily excluded from theoretical consideration.[76] To put it concretely, [pure psychology] is concerned with[77] the animals and human beings that inhabit a presupposed **<p. 23="p. 12">** spatial world;[78] and just as physical somatology explores such animals and human beings with a systematic methodical focus on only one side of them – the animate organism aspect – so pure psychology explores them with an equally systematic focus on only the other side – the pure psychic aspect.[79] Even when doing pure psychology we still stand, as psychologists, on the ground of positivity; we are and remain explorers simply of the world or of a [particular] world, and thus all our research remains transcendentally **[p. 273]** naïve. Despite their purity, all pure

---

"When I make a general reduction to my pure psyche and that of all others, the world that has been rendered questionable in the transcendental inquiry is certainly no longer presupposed. Although the world still has straightforward validity for these psyches, it is not the focus of attention; rather, the focus is only the pure being and life of the very psyches in which the world, via the corresponding subjective modes of appearance and belief, acquires meaning and validity."

Husserl (B1, p. 22.16–25) changed these two sentences to read: "When I make a general and, as is required, a rigorously consistent reduction to the pure psyches of myself and others, I practice epoché with regard to the world that has been rendered questionable in the transcendental inquiry, that is, the world that these psyches accept, in a straightforward manner, as valid. The theme is to be simply the pure being and life of the very psyches in which the world appears and in which, via the corresponding subjective modes of appearance and belief, that world acquires meaning and validity for their ego-subjects." This changed text appears in *Hu* IX, p. 272.16–24.

[76] Heidegger's note here (B3, p. 22.28, bottom margin, keyed to this passage; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 272, n. 1) is highlighted in red:

"What kind of 'excluding from consideration' is this? Is it the reduction? If so, then even here, in the *pure* psyche, I *emphatically* do *not* have the *a priori* of the psyche as such."

Husserl copied this note in shorthand into the corresponding bottom margin of B1.

[77] Heidegger (B3, p. 22.28; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 604, re 272.27–28) changes the first part of this sentence to:

"The object[s] of the investigation are...."

[78] Husserl (B1, p. 22.28 and p. 23.1) changes this to read: "To put it concretely, [pure psychology] is concerned with presumptively [*vorausgesetztermaßen*] existent animals and human beings of an existent spatial world." See *Hu* IX, p. 272.27–29.

[79] See Heidegger's "Appendix I," paragraph 4, below, where Heidegger argues that these "one-sided" treatments presuppose the concrete ontological totality of the human being.

psychic phenomena have the ontological sense of worldly real facts,[80] even when they are treated eidetically as possible facts of a world which is posited as general possibility but which, for that very reason, is also unintelligible from a transcendental point of view. For the psychologist, who as psychologist remains in positivity, the systematic psychological-phenomenological reduction, with its epoché regarding the existing world, is merely a means for reducing the human and animal psyche to its own pure and proper essence, all of this against the background of the world that, as far as the psychologist is concerned, remains continually in being and constantly valid. Precisely for that reason this phenomenological reduction, seen from the transcendental viewpoint, is characterized as inauthentic and transcendentally non-genuine.

[Transcendental Reduction and the Semblance of Doubling][81]

If the transcendental problem is concerned with the ontological sense of any world at all as getting its meaning and validity only from functions of consciousness, then the transcendental philosopher must practice an effectively unconditioned epoché regarding the world and so must effectively posit and maintain in validity only conscious subjectivity, whence ontological sense and validity are produced. Thus, because the world is present for me only thanks to my life of experiencing, thinking, and so forth, it makes sense at the outset to go back precisely to my own self in its absolute[82] proper essentialness, to reduce back to my **<p. 24="p. 13">** pure life and this alone, precisely as it can be experienced in absolute self-experience.

But is this really something different from reduction to my pure psyche? Here is the decisive point which differentiates the genuine transcendental-phenomenological reduction from the psychological reduction (the latter being necessary for the positive scientist but not transcendentally genuine). According to the sense of the transcendental question I as a transcendental phenomenologist place the whole world entirely and absolutely within this

---

[80] "*weltlich reale Tatsachen*" is underlined in pencil in B3, p. 23.9. (See *Hu* IX, p. 273.2). This apparently is the phrase Heidegger refers to in his Appendix I, third paragraph ("'*weltlich reale Tatsache*'"; Heidegger neglects to close the quotes in his ms.) when he remarks that the human being is "never a 'worldly real fact.'"

[81] *Hu* IX, pp. 273.13–276.22. The contents of these pages correspond in general to Draft D, II. §9, "The Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction and the Semblance of Transcendental Doubling."

[82] Heidegger at this point (B3, p. 23.28; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 604, re 273.21) inserts a red "T" and in the left margin he writes:

"meaning?" [*heißt?*]

The note is circled in red and thus refers to the appendices to Heidegger's letter, presumably to Appendix I but also to Appendix II, the fourth paragraph: "*Was heißt absolutes ego im Unterschied vom rein Seelischen?*" ("What does the absolute ego mean as distinct from the pure psychic?") and perhaps the fifth paragraph. Two other marginal notes by Heidegger are erased in the margin here.

question. With equal all-inclusiveness, therefore, I stop every positive question, every positive judgment, and the whole of natural experience *qua* pre-accepted valid basis for possible judgments. [On the one hand[83]] my line of questioning requires that I avoid the transcendental circle, which consists in presupposing something as beyond question when in fact it is encompassed by the all-inclusiveness of that very question. On the other hand [it requires[84]] a reduction to the very basis of validity that this question as such presupposes: pure subjectivity as the source of sense and validity. Thus, as a transcendental **[p. 274]** phenomenologist, what I have now is not my ego as a psyche – for the very meaning of the word "psyche" presupposes an actual or possible world. Rather, I have that transcendentally pure ego within which even this psyche, with its transcendent sense, is endowed, from out of the hidden functions of consciousness, with the sense and validity it has for me.[85]

When, as a psychologist, I take myself as a pure psychological theme, I certainly do discover, along with all the pure psychic, that [element] as well in which I come to have an "idea" of myself as the psyche of this worldly corporeality of mine; and I prove its validity, define it more closely, and so on. So too my psychological activity, all my scientific work – in short, anything and everything that belongs to me as a pure subject – all of it I can and **<p. 25="p. 14">** must acquire in this way. But the very habituality of the psychological attitude, which we call its positivity, entails that at each step one is always effecting anew or keeping in effect (but always latently) the apperception of the world,[86] within which everything that [eventually] becomes a specific

---

[83] Heidegger recommends (B3, p. 24.12; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 273.35) that Husserl add the phrase "**On the one hand**" here.

[84] Heidegger (B3, p. 22.14) here inserts

"**it requires**" (*verlangt sie*)

Hu IX, p. 273.37, without textual evidence, substitutes "*fordert*" for "*verlangt*."

[85] Heidegger's double note at this point (B3, p. 24.22 left margin running into the bottom margin; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 274, n. 1) is highlighted in red. Husserl copies it in shorthand into the corresponding left margin of B1:

"Does not a world-as-such belong to the essence of the pure ego? **Cf. our conversation in Todtnauberg [April, 1926] about 'being-in-the-world' (*Sein und Zeit*, I, §12, §69) and its essential difference from *presence-at-hand* 'within' such a world."**

Regarding the disposition of this marginal note: Heidegger underlines Husserl's words "world" and "pure ego" and connects them with a line; he underlines "transcendent"; and in the left margin he writes the above note. The first sentence is bracketed in red.

Heidegger then draws a line separating the first sentence from the second one, which is not bracketed in red. The word "presence-at-hand" [*Vorhandensein*] is underlined in Heidegger's handwritten marginal note in B3, but not in Husserl's shorthand transcription of it in the corresponding margin in B1.

[86] Heidegger's note at this point (B3, p. 25.4, left margin; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 274, n. 2) is highlighted in red:

"1. [As] something present-at-hand! But human Dasein 'is' in such a way that, although it is an entity, it is never simply present-at-hand."

Disposition of the note:

theme is inserted as a worldly thing, Of course all these [acts] – in general, all apperceptive performances and validations – belong to the psychological realm, but always in such a way that the apperception of the world remains universally accepted as valid; and whenever something new emerges, it always becomes, within [that] apperception, a worldly thing. The disclosing of the mind is an infinite process, but so too is psychic self-apperception in the form of worldliness.

It is the transcendental reduction's fundamental and proper character that, from the very beginning and with one blow – by means of an all-inclusive theoretical act of will – it checks this transcendental naïveté that still remains as a residue[87] in pure psychology: it encompasses the whole of current and habitual life with this act of will:[88] This will demands that we practice no transcendent apperception and no transcendent validation, whatever its condition. It demands that we "put [all this] in brackets" and take it only as what it is in itself: a pure subjective act of perceiving, meaning, positing-as-valid, and so on. After I do this to **[p. 275]** myself, I am not a human ego[89] even though I

This and three more marginal notes all appear in B3, on p. 25, and three of the four are numbered by Heidegger. The present note, which Heidegger designates with a "1," is bordered in red and topped off with a red circle. Husserl copied it in shorthand into the corresponding margin in B1.

[87] Heidegger (B3, p. 25.15), using red, (1) underlines "remains as a residue", (2) also underlines the word "whole" [*ganze*] towards the end of that line, and (3) puts an exclamation point in the left margin. Apparently the exclamation point indicates a contradiction between, on the one hand, saying the transcendental reduction affects the *whole* of habitual life and, on the other hand, saying that such naïveté is there merely as a residue. In B1 Husserl copies the exclamation point into the corresponding margin and changes the phrase "remains as a residue" [*übrig bleibt*] to "dominates" [*herrscht*]. See *Hu* IX, p. 274.28.

[88] Heidegger's note at this point (B3, p. 25.16–17, left margin; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 274, n. 3) is underlined in red:

"2. And [what about] this will itself!" ["*Und dieser Wille selbst!*]."

Heidegger may be indicating that, if the transcendental epoché is as universal as Husserl claims, it must paradoxically bracket out even this act of will itself. Or he may be alluding to the need to question this "will" in terms of what he calls "Entschlossenheit" [resoluteness].

Disposition of this second note on p. 25: (1) Husserl copies Heidegger's note, in shorthand, into B1, along with the exclamation point. (2) Unlike Husserl, Biemel (*Hu* IX, p. 274, n. 3) takes Heidegger's explanation point to be a question mark.

[89] In B3 Heidegger provides two marginal notes on this phrase, both of which are highlighted in red, and both of which Husserl copies in shorthand into the corresponding margin in B1 (see *Hu* IX, p. 275, n. 1):

Note [A]: At B3, p. 25.21, left margin and running down to the bottom margin:

"3b. Why not? Isn't this action a possibility of the human being, but one which, precisely because the human being is never present-at-hand, is a *comportment* [a way of 'having oneself'], i.e., a way of being which comes into its own entirely from out of itself and thus never belongs to the positivity of something present-at-hand." ["Warum nicht? Ist dieses Tun nicht eine Möglichkeit des Menschen, aber eben weil dieser nie vorhanden ist, ein *Verhalten*, d.h. eine Seinsart, die eben von Hause aus sich sich selbst verschafft, also nie zur Positivität des Vorhandenen gehört."]

Note [B]: At B3, top margin:

lose nothing of the proper and essential content of my pure psyche (and thus, nothing of the pure psychological). What is bracketed is only the positing-as-valid that I had performed in the attitude of "I, this human being" and the attitude of "my psyche in the world"; what is not bracketed is that positing and that having-as-valid *qua* lived experience. This reduced ego is certainly [still] my "I" in the whole concretion of my life, but it is seen directly in transcendentally reduced inner experience **<p. 26="p. 15">** – and now it really is the concrete ego, the absolute presupposition for all transcendence that is valid for "me." In fact it is evident that the ego in its [now transcendentally] reduced peculiarity is the only one[90] that is positable [*setzbar*][91] with all its intentional correlates, and that it therefore offers me the most fundamental and primordial experiential ground for transcendental exploration. The phen-

---

"3a. Or maybe [one is] precisely that [namely, a human ego] in its ownmost 'wondersome' possibility-of-Existenz. Compare p. 27 below, where you speak of a 'kind of transformation of one's whole way of life.'" ["Oder vielleicht gerade solches, in seiner eigensten, 'wundersamen' Existenzmöglichkeit. Vg. S. 27 unten, wo Sie von einer 'Art Änderung der Lebensform' sprechen."]

Disposition of these notes:

Note [A]: In Husserl's text Heidegger underlines "I am" and "not" in the phrase "I am not a human ego" (B3, p. 25.21; *Hu* IX, p. 275.1) and, a few lines below, underlines the words "is certainly" in the phrase "is certainly my 'I'" (B3, p. 25.27; *Hu* IX, p. 275.7) and connects the two underlinings with a line, as if to point to an apparent contradiction. At that point, it would seem, Heidegger writes out the first note – "[A]" (above) in the left margin and numbers it simply as "3" and blocks it in red, topping it off with a red circle. Husserl copies it into B1.

Note [B]: Apparently later, after reading ahead to B3, p. 27.26 (*Hu* IX, p. 276.34–35) where the phrase "a kind of transformation of one's whole form of life" appears, Heidegger returned to B3, p. 25 and wrote the second note – "[B]" above – in the top margin, keyed it to the phrase "I am not a human ego," numbered it as "3a," and then renumbered note "3" as "3b" – so that they would be read in the reverse order in which they were written. Prof. Biemel provides these two marginal notes in the 3a–3b order at *Hu* IX, p. 275, n. 1.

In Note [B] Heidegger's phrase "p. 27" refers ahead to B3, p. 27.26 (*Hu* IX, p. 276.34–35), specifically to the German words "*eine Art Änderung der ganzen Lebensform.*" In *Hu* IX, p. 275, n. 1, Prof. Biemel erroneously takes the reference to be to *Hu* IX, p. 276.36, where in fact a different and distinct note of Heidegger's appears.

[90] "*...ist...ausschliesslich* setzbar...": literally "is....exclusively positable."

[91] Heidegger underlines "*setzbar*" in red. His note in the left margin (B3, p. 26.4, left margin, blocked in red; cf. *Hu* IX, 604, re 275.12–13) is highlighted in red:

"[So it is a] *positum*! Something positive! Or else what kind of *positing* is this? In what sense [can one say] that this *posited-something is* – if it is supposed to be not nothing [but] rather in a certain way everything?" ["positum! Positives! Oder was ist das für eine *Setzung*? In welchem Sinne *ist* dieses *Gesetzte*, wenn es nicht nichts [underlined twice], vielmehr in gewisser Weise Alles sein soll?"]

Concerning the note: (1) Husserl copies the note, in shorthand, into the corresponding margin in B1. Also in B1 he crosses out "*ausschliesslich setzbar*" and substitutes for it "*ein [in] sich abgeschlossenes Erfahrungsfeld*" ["a self-enclosed field of experience"]. This latter is the text reproduced in *Hu* IX, p. 275.12–13. (2) Heidegger's marginal note is apparently related to [A] "Appendix I," paragraph 5: "That which does the constituting is not nothing; hence it is something and it is in being – although not in the sense of something positive." and [B] "Appendix II," sixth paragraph: "What is the character of the positing in which the absolute ego is *something-posited*? To what extent is there no positivity (positedness) here?" (3) It may be that Heidegger, in his phrase "in gewisser Weise Alles," intends to echo Aristotle's ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ ὄντα πώς ἐστι πάντα (*De Anima* Γ, 8, 431 b 21): "The soul is in some way all things."

omena attained in this transcendental reduction are transcendental phenomena.[92]

Every single pure psychic experience – once we take the next step of submitting it to the transcendental reduction that purifies it of worldly sense – produces a transcendental experience that is identical [to the pure psychic experience] as regards content but that is freed of its "psychic" (that is, worldly, real) sense. In precisely this way the psychic ego is transformed into the transcendental ego, which, in each of its self-disclosing reflections (transcendental reflections), always rediscovers itself in its own transcendental peculiarities, just as the psychological ego, in keeping with the change in reductive focus, always rediscovers itself in its own psychological peculiarities. In this way there comes to light this wondrous parallelism of the psychological and the transcendental, which extends to all descriptive and genetic determinations that can be worked out on either side in the respective systematically maintained attitude.

The[93] same holds if I as a psychologist practice the intersubjective reduction **[p. 276]** and, by prescinding from all psychophysical connections, thoroughly examine the pure psychic nexus of a possible personal community, and then carry out the transcendental purification. This purification prescinds not just from the positively valid physical, as above; rather, it is a fundamental "bracketing" of the whole world, and it accepts as valid only the world as phenomenon. In this case what is left over is not the psychical nexus, as in the former instance; rather, the result is the absolute **<p. 27="p. 16">** nexus of absolute egos – the transcendentally intersubjective nexus – in which the world of positivity is "transcendentally constituted" with its categorial sense for entities that in themselves exist intersubjectively. However, one may (as in E. Husserl's *Ideen* I) follow transcendental rather than psychological interests and take up, from the very beginning, the transcendental reduction, both

---

[92] Husserl (B1, p. 26.6–8) brackets out this sentence in the original draft and substitutes for it the following: "Transcendental experience is nothing other than the transcendentally reduced objective world, or, what amounts to the same thing, transcendentally reduced pure psychological experience. In place of psychological 'phenomena' we now have transcendental 'phenomena.'" See *Hu* IX, p. 275.15–19.

[93] In B1, p. 26.20 to 27.7, Husserl changes this sentence and the next three sentences (that is, down to "...both egological and intersubjective.") to read as follows: "The same holds if I as a psychologist practice the intersubjective reduction and, by prescinding from all psychophysical connections, thereby discover the pure psychic nexus of a possible personal community, and then, as a second step, carry out the *transcendental purification*. This purification is quite unlike that of the psychologist, which remains within natural positivity and then, by prescinding from the bodies co-present with psyches, reveals the social bonds of pure psyches. Rather, it consists in the radical epoché of the intersubjectively present world and in the reduction to that [level of] intersubjectivity in whose inner intentionality this intersubjective presence occurs. This is what yields us all as transcendental subjects of a transcendental, intersubjectively connected life within which the intersubjective world of natural positivity has become a mere phenomenon. However, (and historically this is the road phenomenology took) one may take up, from the very beginning and with a single stroke, the transcendental reduction (both egological and intersubjective)." This amended text is the one that appears in *Hu* IX, p. 275.33 to 276.16.

egological and intersubjective. In that case, what emerges is not at all pure psychology but immediately[94] transcendental phenomenology as a science (fashioned purely from transcendental experience) both of transcendental intersubjectivity – indeed, thanks to the requisite eidetic method, an *a priori* possible transcendental intersubjectivity – as well as of possible worlds (or environments[95]) as transcendental correlates.[96]

[Pure Psychology as a Propaedeutic to Transcendental Phenomenology][97]

Now one understands in depth the power of psychologism. Every pure psychological insight (such as, for example, all the psychological analyses – even if imperfectly sketched – that logicians, ethicists, and so on, make of judgmental cognition, ethical life, and the like) is, as regards its whole content, in fact able to be utilized transcendentally so long as it receives its pure sense through the genuine transcendental reduction.

Likewise one now understands the pedagogical[98] significance of pure psychology as a means of ascent to transcendental philosophy,[99] which is completely independent of its significance for making possible an "exact" science of psychological facts. For essential and easily understood reasons, humankind as a whole, as well as each individual human being, has, in the first instance, always lived and continues to live lives entirely and exclusively in positivity. Thus, the transcendental reduction is a kind of transformation of one's whole way of life,[100] one that completely transcends[101] all life experi-

---

[94] Changed in B1, p. 27.7–8 to: "...pure psychology as a connecting link but, from the very start,...."

[95] Reading "*Umwelten*" for the "*Unwelten*" that appears at B2, p. 27.12.

[96] In B1, p. 27.9–12 Husserl changes the second half of this sentence to read: "...transcendental phenomenology as a science (fashioned purely from transcendental intuition) of transcendental intersubjectivity – indeed, thanks to the requisite eidetic method, a transcendental intersubjectivity that is *a priori* possible and related to possible worlds as intentional correlates." This changed text is reproduced in *Hu* IX, p. 276.19–22.

[97] *Hu* IX, p. 276.22–277.21 (i.e., the end of Section iii). The content of these pages corresponds generally to Draft D, II, §10, "Pure Psychology as a Propaedeutic to Transcendental Phenomenology."

[98] Changed in B1, p. 27.19–20, to "propaedeutic."

[99] The following dependent clause is crossed out in B1, p. 27.21–23.

[100] Heidegger (B3, p. 27.25–26, left margin) draws a red circle next to the line "eine Art Änderung der ganzen Lebensform...." The red circle refers Husserl back to Heidegger's note in the top margin of B3, p. 25 (Note "3a": "...Compare p. 27 below, where you speak of a 'kind of transformation of one's whole way of life.'"). That Husserl understood Heidegger's mark in this way is shown by his own note in the left margin of B1 at this point: "Cf. Heidegger p. 25" (B1, p. 27.26).

[101] Heidegger underlines this word (*übersteigt*) in red. Keyed to this word, he writes a note in the left margin, running to the bottom margin; (B3, 27.27, cf. *Hu* IX, p. 276, n. 1):

ence heretofore and that, due to its absolute foreignness, is hard to understand both in its possibility and **[p. 277]** actuality. **<p. 28="p. 17">** The same holds correspondingly for a transcendental science. Although phenomenological psychology is relatively new and, in its method of transcendental analysis, even novel, nonetheless it is as universally accessible as are all the positive sciences.[102] Once one has systematically disclosed, in (pure psychology), the realm of the pure psychic, one thereby already possesses, implicitly and even materially, the content of the parallel transcendental sphere, and all that is needed is the doctrine that is capable of merely reinterpreting [the pure psychological sphere] rather than supplementing it [by adding something on to it].[103] [104]

To be sure, because the transcendental concern is the supreme and ultimate human concern, it would be better "in itself" if, both historically and factically, the theories of subjectivity, which for profound transcendental reasons are ambiguous, were developed within transcendental philosophy. Then, by a corresponding change in focus, the psychologist can "read" transcendental phenomenology for his own purposes "as" pure psychology. The transcenden-

---

"An ascent (a climbing up) that nonetheless remains 'immanent,' that is, a *human possibility* in which, precisely, human beings come to themselves." ["Ascendenz (Hinaufstieg), die doch 'immanent' bleibt, d.h. eine *menschliche Möglichkeit*, in der der Mensch zu sich selbst {underlined twice} kommt."]

This note likewise refers back to B3, p. 25, both to Note 3b, where Heidegger spoke of the transcendental reduction as "*eine Möglichkeit des Menschen*" and to Note 3a, where he spoke of it as a "transformation" in which Dasein becomes "its ownmost 'wondersome' possibility-of-*Existenz*."

[102] This sentence and the previous are taken over virtually verbatim into Draft C, p. 29 and Draft D, p. 24.

[103] Husserl's original text in B3, p. 28.7–8 is: "*...und es bedarf nur der nicht ergänzenden sondern zur ihrer Umdeutung berufenen Lehren.*"

[104] Heidegger's note (B3, p. 28.8, left margin to bottom margin; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 277, n. 1):

"But on the contrary, isn't this *'reinterpretation'* really only a *'supplemental'* application [or: utilization] of the transcendental problematic that you find incompletely [worked out] in pure psychology, such that when the psychical comes on the scene as a self-transcending [entity], from that moment on, everything positive is rendered transcendentally problematic – everything: both the psychical itself and the entities (world) constituted *in it*."
["Aber ist diese *'Umdeutung'* nicht doch nur die *'ergänzende'* Anwendung der transzendentalen Problematik, die Sie unvollständig in der reinen Psychologie finden, sodaß mit dem Einrücken des Psychischen als eines Selbsttranszendenten nunmehr alles Positive transzendental problematisch wird – alles – das Psychische selbst und das *in ihm* sich konstituierende Seiende (Welt)."]

Concerning the note:

(1) Heidegger's note is preceded by "! X !" heavily marked in red in the left margin. Husserl reproduces these latter marks, along with Heidegger's note, in the corresponding margin of B1.

(2) In B1 Husserl changes the preceding sentence and this one to read: "...one has thereby – implicitly and even materially – the content of the parallel sphere. All that is needed is the doctrine of the transcendental reduction, which is capable of reinterpreting [the pure psychological sphere] into the transcendental [sphere]." See *Hu* IX, p. 277.6–9.

(3) Biemel transcribes Heidegger's handwritten phrase "*eines selbst transzendenten*" as "*eines selbst Transzendenten.*" But it could equally be read as "*eines Selbst-transzendenten*" *or* "*eines selbsttranszendenten [Seienden].*" In any case, the word "transcendent" in this context means "self-transcending" rather than "transcendent" in the sense of "present-at-hand in the physical world."

tal reduction is not a blind change of focus; rather, as the methodological principle of all transcendental method, it is itself clarified reflectively and transcendentally. In this way, one may say, the enigma of the "Copernican Revolution" is completely solved.

End of Draft B

[p. 600] <p. 1>[105]

HEIDEGGER'S LETTER AND APPENDICES*[106]

Messkirch
October 22, 1927

Dear fatherly friend,

My thanks to you and Mrs. Husserl for the recent days in Freiburg. I truly had the feeling of being accepted as a son.

Only in actual work do the problems become clear. Therefore, mere holiday conversations, enjoyable as they are, yield nothing. But this time everything was under the pressure of an urgent and important task. And only in the last few days have I begun to see the extent to which your emphasis on pure psychology provides the basis for clarifying – or unfolding for the first time with complete exactness – the question of transcendental subjectivity and its relation to the pure psychic. My disadvantage, to be sure, is that I do not know your concrete investigations of the last few years.* Therefore, my objections appear simply as formalistic.[107]

<p. 2>In the enclosed pages I attempt once more to fix the essential points. This also gives me an occasion to characterize the fundamental orientation of *Being and Time* within the transcendental problem.[108]

Pages 21–28[109] are written essentially more concisely than the first draft. The structure is transparent. After repeated examination, I have put the stylistic abbreviations and glosses directly into the text. The marginal notes in red concern questions about issues that I summarize briefly in Appendix I to this letter.

Appendix II deals with questions about the arrangement of those same pages. The only thing that matters for the article is that the problematic of phenomenology be expressed in the form of a concise and very impersonal report. Granted that the clarity of the presentation presupposes an ultimate clarification of the issues, nonetheless your aim, or that of the article, must remain confined to a clear presentation of the essentials.

[p. 601] <p. 3>

For all intents and purposes the course of our conversations has shown that

---

[105] Page numbers in angled brackets indicate the eight pages of Heidegger's handwritten letter and appendices.

[106] Asterisks in the text of Heidegger's letter and appendices refer to explanatory notes found below.

[107] Presumably Heidegger is referring to his objections to Husserl's Draft A of the EB article.

[108] Heidegger crosses out a redundant "*des Problems*" between "*innerhalb*" ("within") and "*des transzendentalen Problems*" ("of the transcendental Problem").

[109] That is, Section iii above.

you should not delay any further with your longer publications. In the last few days you repeatedly remarked that a pure psychology does not yet really exist. Now – the essential elements are there in the three sections of the manuscript typed by Landgrebe.[110]

These investigations [relating to pure psychology] must be published first, and that for two reasons: (1) so that one may have the concrete investigations in front of him and not have to go searching in vain for them as some promised program, and (2) so that you yourself may have some breathing space for [preparing] a fundamental exposition of the transcendental problematic.

I would ask you to stick to the second draft for the "*Studien* [*zur Struktur des Bewußtseins*]" as a guide. I have now read it through once again, and I stand by the judgment I made in my previous letter. –[111]

***

Yesterday I received from my wife the letter from Richter (a copy of which is in Appendix III). I have written to Mahnke.*

Of course here I do not get down to my own work. That will be a fine mess, what with the lecture course and the two seminars* and the lectures **<p. 4>** in Cologne and Bonn,* and Kuki besides.*

However, the requisite enthusiasm for the problem is alive; the rest will have to be done by force.

Next week I leave here to see Jaspers,[112] whom I will ask for some tactical advice for myself.

I wish you a successful conclusion of the Article, which will keep many problems astir in you as a starting point for further publications.

Again, you and Mrs. Husserl have my cordial thanks for those lovely days. I send you my greetings in true friendship and respect.

Yours,
Martin Heidegger

---

[110] The "*Studien zur Struktur des Bewußtseins*," (Husserl-Archives, M III 3, I to III). See *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 145, n. 70.

[111] Heidegger uses a dash, followed by a space (omitted at *Hu* IX, p. 601), to separate this paragraph and the next.

[112] That is, on Monday, October 23. See Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 22 (October 21, 1927), postscript.

APPENDIX I*
Difficulties With Issues

We are in agreement on the fact that entities in the sense of what you call "world"[113] cannot be explained in their transcendental constitution by returning to an entity of the same mode of being.

But that does not mean that what makes up the place of the transcendental is not an entity at all; rather, precisely at this juncture there arises the *problem*:[114] What is the mode of being of the entity in which "world" is constituted? That is *Being and Time*'s central problem – namely, a fundamental ontology of Dasein. It has to be shown that the mode of being of human Dasein is totally different from that of all other entities and that, as the mode of being that it is, it harbors right within itself the possibility of transcendental constitution.

Transcendental constitution is a central possibility of the **[p. 602]** eksistence[115] of the factical self. This factical self, the concrete human being, is as such – as an entity – never a "worldly real fact"[116] because the human being is never merely present-at-hand but rather eksists. And what is "wondersome"* is the fact that the eksistence-structure of Dasein makes possible the transcendental constitution of everything positive.

Somatology's and pure psychology's "one-sided" treatments [of the psychophysical][117] are possible only on the basis of the concrete wholeness of the human being, and this wholeness as such is what primarily determines the human being's mode of being.

The [notion of the] "pure psychic" has arisen without the slightest regard for the ontology of the whole human being, that is to say, without any aim of [developing] a psychology – rather, from the beginning, since the time of Descartes, it has come out of *epistemological* concerns.

That which constitutes is not nothing; hence it is something, and it is in being – although not in the sense of something positive.[118]

The question about the mode of being of what does the constituting is not to be avoided.

Accordingly the problem of being is related – all-inclusively – to what constitutes and to what gets constituted.

---

[113] It would seem Heidegger has in mind Husserl's use of "world" at, for example, *Hu* IX, p. 274.16 (= <p. 24>). See Heidegger's note thereto.

[114] Cf. the series of questions in *Sein und Zeit*, p. 351.34–37 (E.T., p. 402.37–41), which Husserl duly noted in his own copy of the work.

[115] In German, "*Existenz*," Heidegger's word for Dasein's being (*das Sein des Daseins*) as a "standing out into" ("ek-sistence") possibility; hence: eksistence.

[116] Heidegger seems to be referring to Husserl's phrase "*weltlich reale Tatsachen*" (B3, p. 23.9; *Hu* IX, p. 273.2). Cf. n. 81 above.

[117] Cf. *Hu* IX, p. 272.27–33.

[118] Cf. *Hu* IX, p. 275.

APPENDIX II*
Re: Arrangement of Pages 21ff.[119]

The *first* thing in the presentation of the transcendental problem is to clarify what the "unintelligibility" of entities means.[120]

- In what respect are entities unintelligible? i.e., what higher claim of intelligibility is possible and necessary.
- By a return to what is this intelligibility achieved?
- What is the meaning of the absolute ego as distinct from the pure psychic?[121]
- What is the mode of being of this absolute ego – in what sense is it the *same* as the ever factical "I"; in what sense is it *not* the same?
- What is the character of the positing in which the absolute ego is *something posited*? To what extent is there no positivity (positedness) here?[122]
- The all-inclusiveness of the transcendental problem.

APPENDIX III

"I have the pleasure of being able to inform you that the Minister has decided to assign you the chair as full professor of philosophy at the University [of Marburg].* On consideration of your present income your basic salary would be set at 6535 Reich Marks yearly, increasing as is customary every two years to the sum of 9360 Reich Marks.

"While inviting you to express your opinion on this settlement, I likewise have the honor of informing you that Privatdozent Dr. Mahnke from Greifswald has been called to the professorship that you have held up to now.

With best regards,
[Richter]"

[END OF HEIDEGGER'S APPENDICES]

---

[119] That is, Section iii of Draft B: *Hu* IX, pp. 271.1–277.21.

[120] See *Hu* IX, p. 271.5 <p. 21="p. 10">: "a cloud of unintelligiblity spreads over the whole world"; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 273.5 <p. 23="p.12"> "*unverständlichen Welt*," and p. 264.22 <p. 12="p. 1"> "*unverständlich*."

[121] See above re *Hu* IX, p. 273.21 (B3 p. 23.28): "my own self in its absolute proper essentialness" and the note thereto.

[122] See above re *Hu* IX, p. 275.12–13 (B3 p. 26.4): "...the ego...that is exclusively positable..." and Heidegger's note thereto.

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON HEIDEGGER'S LETTER AND APPENDICES

The handwritten letter and appendices: Heidegger's letter is written on a single sheet of paper, 28 x 22.5 cm, folded in half to make four pages of 14 x 22.5 cm. Heidegger's letter covers all four folio pages. Appendix I is on two pages, 14 x 22.4 cm., with writing on only one side of each page. Appendix II is written on a single side of paper, 14 x 22.5 cm. Appendix III is written on one side of a single paper, 14.5 x 14.5 cm.

"I do not know your concrete investigations of the last few years": On February 7, 1925, Husserl wrote to Heidegger: "Ever since I began in Freiburg, however, I have made such essential advances precisely in the questions of nature and spirit that I had to elaborate a completely new exposition with a content which was in part completely altered." This excerpt is from a letter that is not found in the *Briefwechsel.* Heidegger read the above lines to his students on June 12, 1925, prefacing the reading by saying: "I am not sufficiently conversant with the contents of the present stance of his investigations. But let me say that Husserl is aware of my objections from my lecture courses in Freiburg as well as here in Marburg and from personal conversations, and is essentially making allowances for that, so that my critique today no longer applies in its full trenchancy." Cited from Heidegger, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs, Gesamtausgabe* II/20, p. 167–8; E.T. *History of the Concept of Time*, p. 121. See also *Sein und Zeit*, p. 47, n. 1; *Being and Time*, p. 489, n. ii (H. 47): "Husserl has studied these problems [of the constitution of nature and spirit] still more deeply since this first treatment of them; essential portions of his work have been communicated in his Freiburg lectures."

"Yesterday I received...written to Mahnke": Heidegger is indicating that, on Friday, October 21, the day after he had arrived in Messkirch, he received the letter (forwarded by his wife in Todtnauberg) from the Minister of Education Richter, appointing him to the chair at Marburg. See also Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, pp. 21–22 (letter of October 21, 1927): "The minister has decided to give me Natorp's job of full professor. I got the news yesterday, along with word that they have decided that my successor is to be Privatdozent Mahnke, who had been proposed for the full professorship." On Wednesday, October 19, the day before leaving Husserl's house, he wrote to Jaspers from Freiburg to say that he had news (presumably not yet in writing) that he had been named to the position: Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, p. 82.

Dietrich Mahnke (1884–1939) studied mathematics and philosophy with Husserl at Göttingen (1902 to 1906) and took his doctorate under him in 1922 with a work entitled *Leibnizens Synthese von Universalmathematik und Individualmetaphysik*, which Husserl published in the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, VII (1925), pp. 305–612. He taught at Greifswald until 1927, when he succeeded to Heidegger's associate professorship at Marburg. See *Edmund Husserl und die phänomenologische Bewegung*, p. 434. Heidegger wrote to Mahnke from Messkirch on October 21, 1927, (Nachlass Mahnke, ms. 862, Universitätsbibliothek Marburg), among other things to congratulate him on his appointment and to discuss issues of teaching at Marburg.

"...the lecture course and the two seminars": In the winter semester of 1927–1928, Heidegger delivered a four-hour-per-week lecture course on the *Critique of Pure Reason*. See Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, p. 81, letter of October 6, 1927. The text has been published under the same title as the course: *Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, edited by Ingtraud Görland, GA II, 25, Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1977, second edition, 1987. As Heidegger wrote to Blochmann: "The work-weeks in my study [in Todtnauberg] were nonetheless very productive for me. I worked through Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* in one stretch...": Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 21.

The two seminars ("Übungen," that is, "exercises") were: (1) for advanced students: "Schelling, *Über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit*" (cf. Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, p. 80: letter of September 27, 1927; and p. 62: letter of April 24, 1926); (2) for beginners: "Begriff und Begriffsbildung" ("[The] Concept and Concept-formation"), a topic that in *Sein und Zeit*, p. 349, n. 3 (omitted in later editions but included in *Being and Time*, p. 498) Heidegger said would be treated in the (unpublished) Part One, Division Three of *Sein und Zeit*, specifically in Chapter Two.

"...the lectures in Cologne and Bonn": Theodore Kisiel (private communication, September 28, 1996) places the lectures between November 1–4, 1927, citing Heidegger's letter of November 11, 1927, to Georg Misch: "Last week I gave lectures in Cologne and Bonn, and in fact they required some preparation of me" ["Vorige Woche hatte ich Vorträge in Köln und Bonn, die mich auch einige Vorbereitungen kosteten."] A month later he mentioned the lectures to Elisabeth Blochmann as well: "In Cologne and Bonn I met with some quite nice and genuine success" ["In Köln u. Bo[nn] hatte ich einen schönen u. echten Erfolg"]. Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 22 (December 19, 1927). The content of the lectures is not known, but Kisiel suggests they may have dealt with *Sein und Zeit*, which Scheler and Hartmann were elaborating

in detail in their seminars at Cologne.

"Kuki": Heidegger had met Baron (not Count, as Heidegger incorrectly states in *Unterwegs zur Sprache*) Shûzô Kuki (1888–1941) at Husserl's home on October 12, 1927. Kuki was largely responsible for introducing Heidegger's thought to Japan. He studied in Germany and France from 1922 to 1928. He attended Heidegger's course on *Critique of Pure Reason* (see above), beginning in November of 1927, as well as, up until May 30, 1928, most of "Logic (Leibniz)," since published as GA II, 26. He returned to Japan in April, 1929, and published (in Japanese) *The Structure of "Iki"* (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1930), which at least in part is influenced by Heidegger. Cf. Heidegger's "Von einem Gespräch von der Sprache," *Unterwegs zur Sprache*, Pfullingen: Neske, 1959, third edition 1965, pp. 85ff.; E.T., *On the Way to Language*, translated by Peter D. Hertz, New York: Harper and Row, 1959, pp. 1ff. Also, *Japan und Heidegger: Gedenkschrift der Stadt Meßkirch zum hundertsten Geburtstag Martin Heideggers*, edited by Hartmut Buchner, Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1989, esp. pp. 28–29, 127–138, 268, and photograph no. 7 between pp. 262–263; and *Edmund Husserl und die phänomenologische Bewegung: Zeugnisse in Text und Bild*, edited by Hans Rainer Sepp, Freiburg and Munich: Karl Alber, second edition, 1988, p. 432, with a photograph, p. 287.

Appendix I: Husserl copied out Appendix I in shorthand, analytically dividing it into seven numbered sections. Husserl's shorthand transcription of Appendix I is catalogued in the Husserl-Archives as M III 10 III 3 (B3), pp. 7a-7b. In the following translation of that transcription, the emphasis is Husserl's rather than that in Heidegger's original text.

<p. 7a>

Difficulties with Issues

We are in agreement on the fact that

1) entities in the sense of what you call "world" cannot be explained in their transcendental constitution by returning to an entity of the same mode of being.
2) But that does not mean that what makes up the place of the transcendental is not an entity at all; rather, precisely at this juncture there arises the problem: *What is the mode of being of the entity in which "world" is constituted?*

   That is *Being and Time*'s *central problem*

   – namely, a fundamental ontology of "Dasein."
3) It has to be shown that the mode of being of human Dasein is totally different from that of all other entities and *that, as the mode of being that it is, it harbors right within itself the possibility of transcendental constitution.*
4) Transcendental constitution is a central possibility of the *eksistence* of the *factical self.* This factical self, the concrete human being, is as such – as an entity – never a "worldly real fact" because the human being is never merely present-at-hand but rather eksists.

   And what is "wondersome" is the fact that the eksistence-structure of Dasein makes possible the transcendental constitution of everything positive.
5) Somatology's and pure psychology's "one-sided" treatments [of the psycho-physical] are possible only on the basis of the concrete *wholeness of the human being*, and that wholeness as such is *what primary determines the human being's mode of being.*

<page 7b>

5a) The [notion of the] "pure psychic" has arisen without the slightest regard for the ontology of the whole human being, that is to say, without any aim of [developing] a psychology – rather, from the beginning, since the time of Descartes, it has come out of epistemological concerns.
6) That which constitutes is not nothing; hence it is something and it is in being – although not in the sense of something positive.

   The question about the mode of being of what does the constituting is not to be avoided.
7) Accordingly the problem of being is related – all-inclusively – to that which does the constituting and to what gets constituted.

"what is 'wondersome'": In the manuscript of his "Ideas III" Husserl wrote: "Das Wunder aller Wunder ist reines Ich und reines Bewußtsein...." ["The wonder of all wonders is pure Ego and pure consciousness...."] Edmund Husserl, *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, Book III: *Die Phänomenologie und die Fundamente der Wissenschaften*, ed. Marly Biemel, *Husserliana* V, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971, p. 75; E.T. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy,* Book III: *Phenomenology and the Foundations of the Sciences*, translated by Ted E. Klein and William E. Pohl, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980, p. 64. Cf. Heidegger, "Nachwort zu: 'Was ist Metaphysik?'" in *Wegmarken*, p. 307 (earlier edition, p. 103): Heidegger speaks of "das Wunder aller Wunder: *daß* Seiende *ist*." "The human being alone of all entities, addressed by the voice of being, experiences the wonder of all wonders: *that* entities *are*." "Postscript" to "What is Metaphysics?" in Walter Kaufmann, editor, *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*, New York: Penguin/Meridian, 1975, p. 261 [translation amended].

Appendix II: Husserl rewrote Heidegger's Appendix II in shorthand and numbered the points as "1" through "7," beginning with the first sentence. The page is preserved in B3 (M III 10, III 3), numbered as p. 9. See here, p. 143.

"...the chair as full professor of philosophy...": The opening had been occasioned by the transference of Professor Nicolai Hartmann to Cologne in 1925. Heidegger accepted the position and on November 2, 1927, was officially named to the position, with retroactive appointment to October 1, 1927 (Akten Universität Marburg / Betreffend Die Professoren der philosophischen Fakultät" [1922–1940], Bestand 307d, Nr. 28, Document of November 9, 1927, Nr. 5980, archived November 12, 1927, Nr. 523.)

HUSSERL'S SHORTHAND NOTE FROM B1, p. 2

On the back of B1, p. 2 Husserl writes the following text in shorthand. It is difficult to ascertain to what passage of the typescript (if to any at all) it is intended to pertain. Biemel transcribes the text at *Hu* IX, p. 598–599. The following is a translation of the text.

"Objective sense and object. Possible perception, possible perceptual appearance. Exemplary. Manifolds of perceptions – of perceptual appearances of the same thing. The 'manifold.' The appearing, continuously flowing on – at first in passivity. The activity in the change of appearing. Onesidedness and allsidedness. Allsidedness and the corresponding unity. Manifold of higher levels, whose individualities themselves are already unities of manifolds.

"The intuited thing, onesidedly perceived. Allsided perception of surfaces. Question: Which ways, which constituting 'methods' must I follow in order for the exemplary object, the object intuited in an exemplary starting-point intuition [*Ausgangsanschauung*] to 'come to light,' to 'show itself' according to all its properties, or rather, according the directional tendencies of its properties [*Eigenschaftsrichtungen*]. Evidence –

"The perceived object as such – as the 'X' of undisclosed horizons related to correlative directional tendencies of the 'I can' (or the 'we can'). The I – the center of all possibilities of the 'I can,' of the ability-to-do, of the I-can-operate [*des Mich-bewegen-können*] – the center of the 'surveyable' system of such possibilities of operating, center of the now and the I-am-operating temporally through the ordering-form of the past, [I] traverse my pasts and my futures – in anticipation in the manner of empty, self-traversing thinking. I here – I try to think my way into a progression of myself according to all directional tendencies. For every now and here that I correctly think, I can do the same, I can think the same as done, over and over again. A rule of a doing from out of every exemplary directional tendency – if – then, appearances as motivated being – but also freely producible constructions: a system of actions of thought as constituting, always performable again – correlatively the products present at hand. Products bound to a unity – finally the idea of a universal total-product ('manifold'), for which all products, both achieved and to be achieved, are installment payments, 'appearances.'

"An object – meant – experienced and yet itself still meant as an experienced object, with open horizon. Awakening of the horizon, awakening of my 'I-can system' and of my opposite 'thus' will I find. 'Thus' will come to light. [Biemel places a question mark to indicate the unclarity of Husserl's text here.]

"The problem of completeness regarding the horizonal disclosures – 'What is that,' how I disclose its complete sense – its sense-form, which is the rule of

all possible actually-present [*aktuellen*] disclosures. What perception will bring I do not know, and yet I know what perception can bring. The essence. [*Das Wesen, die Essenz.*] (1) What I can put forth as the essence for example of this thing, the universal that comprises all its being-possibilities. (2) the individual essence, the individual of the universal, the idea of individualizations, which is a thought but not the construable universal."

EDMUND HUSSERL

"PHENOMENOLOGY"
THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE

DRAFT C
SELECTIONS

Translated by Thomas Sheehan

[p. 517]

[INTRODUCTION]
[The Idea of Phenomenology and the Step Back to Consciousness][1]

The world, the all-inclusive unity of entities in real actuality, is the field whence the various positive sciences draw their realms of research. Directed straight at the world, these sciences in their allied totality seem to aim at a complete knowledge of the world and thus to take charge of answering all questions that can be asked about entities. It seems there is no field left to philosophy for its own investigations. But does not Greek science, already in its first decisive beginnings, direct its unceasing efforts towards entities *as such*? Do not entities *as such* serve it as the subject matter of a fundamental science of being, a "first philosophy"? For Greek science, to directly determine entities – both individuals and even the universal whole, and in whatever regard they be taken – did it not mean to understand entities *as such*? Entities *as entities* – that is, with regard to their being – are enigmatic.[2] For a long time the lines of inquiry and the answers remain tangled in obscurities.

Nonetheless, in the first steps of this "first philosophy"[3] one may already see the source whence springs the questionability of entities as such. Parmenides seeks to clarify being[4] via a reflection on one's *thinking* about entities.

---

[1] As Biemel notes (*Hu* IX, pp. 591 and 645), this introduction is a variation on the introduction that Heidegger drafted, with similarities of content and tone but without any indication that it was edited by Heidegger. The text is printed as "Addendum 29" in *Hu* IX, pp. 517–519.

[2] The italics in this and the previous sentence are added by the translator.

[3] Changed by Husserl to: "in the first steps of this philosophy": (*Hu* IX, p. 645). The quotation marks are added by the translator.

[4] Within the text Husserl glosses "being" with "entities as such." [B1, p. 1.18; *Hu* IX, p. 598]

Plato's disclosure of the Ideas takes its bearings from the *soul's soliloquy (logos)* with itself. The Aristotelian categories arise with regard to *reason's* assertoric knowledge. The modern age of philosophy begins with Descartes' explicit founding of first philosophy on the *ego cogito*. Kant's transcendental problematic operates in the field of *consciousness*. The turning of the gaze away from entities and onto consciousness renders perceptible a fundamental relatedness of all entities to consciousness, a relatedness that somehow captures the ontological[5] sense of those entities.

This relatedness must be thoroughly clarified, both in general and as regards all the particular formations and levels of entities, if the cognitional task **[p. 518]** assumed by the positive sciences as a whole is not to remain caught in naïve one-sidedness. At the start of modern times and in a less than pure form at first, the realization begins to dawn that First Philosophy requires a science of conscious subjectivity, specifically as that subjectivity in whose own conscious performances all entities are presented in their respective subjective forms and modes of validity. The new phenomenology is this science: here its idea is elaborated purely and fundamentally and carried out systematically. In its comprehensive elaboration it is the realization of the idea of a scientific philosophy. It arises from[6] a fundamental clarification of the genuine sense that the return to conscious subjectivity must have, as well as from radical reflection on the paths and procedural rules of this return, and finally from a method (motivated by the foregoing) for clearly highlighting the field of intuition of "pure consciousness," a field that is presupposed in philosophical inquiry as unproblematic. The systematic exploration of this field is then the theoretical task of phenomenology as a science.

But is not psychology already competent to do the work assigned to phenomenology? Is not psychology the science of conscious subjectivity, including all the subjective forms whereby entities are presented in consciousness? Therefore, what more could be required for philosophy besides a "pure" psychology rigorously and consistently restricted to inner experience alone?[7]

However, a more thoroughgoing reflection on the region and the requisite method of such a pure psychology soon leads one to the insight into the impossibility, on principle, of pure psychology providing foundations for First Philosophy. All the same,[8] there remains an extraordinarily close relation between the psychological doctrines fashioned purely from inner intuition and

---

[5] On the translation of "Seinssinn" by "ontological sense," see the relevant footnote to Draft B, section ii-a, *Hu* IX, p. 264.20: p.118, n. 49 above.

[6] Changed by Husserl from "It is grounded in" (*Hu* IX, p. 645.)

[7] Husserl crossed out the word "perhaps" after "alone" (*Hu* IX, p. 645).

[8] It is with this sentence in particular that Husserl begins to change Heidegger's "Introduction" and, specifically, to add paragraphs that refer ahead to the issues of Parts II and III: the double significance of "consciousness" and their parallelism, the propaedeutic function of phenomenological psychology, the future full system of phenomenological philosophy, etc.

phenomenology's specifically philosophical doctrines. The terms "consciousness" and the "science of consciousness" bear a double significance resting on essential grounds, and unless this double significance is clarified, a secure grounding of philosophy is impossible. In the interests of philosophy, but also in the interests of psychology as a positive science,[9] what is required is the development of a thoroughly self-contained psychological discipline dealing with the essence of pure conscious subjectivity. Even though this discipline, like all positive sciences, is itself not philosophical, it can serve, under the title "psychological phenomenology"[10] as a first step in the upward ascent to philosophical phenomenology.

The idea, method, and problematic [of pure psychology] are dealt with in Part I. In Part II the explanation and purification of the specifically philosophical problem, that of the "transcendental," leads to the method for solving that problem, and it does so by laying out what is presupposed in its very sense, namely, the "transcendentally pure consciousness" as **[p. 519]** the field of the genuine phenomenological science of consciousness. The ideas of a pure psychological science of consciousness and of a philosophical science of consciousness – which get clarified by being contrasted – reveal the parallelism of the contents of their doctrines, a parallelism that makes it unnecessary for the two sciences to undergo separate systematic development. The necessity of a phenomenological grounding of all positive sciences proves that, in the future system of thoroughly grounded sciences, phenomenology must have the pre-eminent place and accordingly that within this system, and without requiring independent development, a psychology will make its appearance only as an application of phenomenology.

By clarifying the profound reasons for the crisis of foundations in modern positive sciences, as well as their essential need for fully adequate grounding, one shows that they all lead back to *a priori* phenomenology as the only science that is methodically self-sufficient and absolutely and intrinsically self-justifying. It encompasses the complete system of every possible *a priori* and thus also of every conceivable method, or, what amounts to the same thing, the complete system of every possible *a priori* science in its absolute grounding. In the transition from *eidos* to *factum* it finally becomes clear that the idea of the systematic totality of positive empirical sciences phenomenologically grounded on an ultimate foundation is equivalent to the idea of a universal empirical phenomenology as a science of factical transcendental subjectivity.[11]

---

[9] Changed to: "In the interests not only of an unconfused philosophy but also of a final grounding of psychology as an exact positive science" (*Hu* IX, p. 645).

[10] Changed by Husserl to: "under the title 'pure or phenomenological psychology,'" *Hu* IX, p. 645.

[11] This last paragraph is taken from Husserl's shorthand appendix. *Hu* IX, p. 645.

[p. 519]

FROM THE LATER PAGES OF THE THIRD DRAFT[12]

[PART III]
[Transcendental Phenomenology as Ontology][13]

<p. 31> Transcendental phenomenology is the science of all conceivable transcendental phenomena in the synthetic totality of forms in which alone those phenomena are concretely possible: the forms of transcendental subjects linked to communities of subjects. For that very reason this phenomenology is *eo ipso* the absolute, universal science of all entities insofar as they get their ontological sense from intentional constitution. That holds as well for the subjects themselves: their being is essentially being-for-themselves. Accordingly, transcendental phenomenology is not one particular science among others; rather, when systematically elaborated, it is the realization of the idea of an absolutely universal science, specifically as eidetic science. As such it must encompass all possible *a priori* sciences in systematic unity, specifically by thoroughly considering the *a priori* connections in absolute grounding.

We could even bring up the traditional expression and broaden it by saying: Transcendental phenomenology is the true and genuinely **[p. 520]** universal ontology that the eighteenth century already strove for but was unable to achieve. It is an ontology that is not stuck either in the naïve one-sidedness of natural positivity or, like the ontologies of Baumgarten and Wolff, in formal generalities and analytic explanations of concepts far removed from issues. Our ontology draws upon the original sources of a universal intuition that studies all essential connections, and it discloses the complete system of forms that pertains to every co-possible *universum* of possible being in general and, included therein, that belongs to every possible world of present **<p. 32>** realities.

Leibniz already had the fundamental insight that in every genuine theoretical knowledge and science the knowledge of possibilities must precede the knowledge of actualities. Accordingly, for every kind of real and ideal sphere of being he required the appurtenant *a priori* sciences as such of pure possibilities (for example, even a pure grammar, a pure doctrine of law, and so forth). Consequently he grasped the true meaning of the distinctive achievement of the exact natural sciences and their exemplar role for the methodic

---

[12] *Hu* IX, pp. 519.26–526.44, reproducing C3 pp. 31.1–43.17.

[13] *Hu* IX, pp. 519.26–520.34 (= C3 p. 31.1–32.24). The material generally corresponds to that of Draft D III, §11, from which we take the title. We have added some of the paragraph breaks in the following pages.

formation of all sciences of reality. Since Bacon modernity has been imbued with the striving for a universal world-knowledge in the form of a complete system of the sciences that deal with real things, which, if it is supposed to be truly scientific knowledge fashioned via a method of rational insight, could in fact be fulfilled only by systematically pursuing the *a priori* that belongs to the concretion of the whole world and by unfolding that *a priori* in a systematic assemblage of all *a priori* sciences of real things. Of course, Leibniz' grand design lost its effective power as a consequence of Kant's critique of the ontology of the Leibnizian-Wolffian school; not even the *a priori* of nature was developed in systematic completeness. Nonetheless, that part of the project that survived brought about the exact methodological form of the physical disciplines. However, this [methodological] superiority does not yet mean that these disciplines have a fundamentally complete methodological form.

[Phenomenology and the Crisis in the Foundations of the Exact Sciences][14]

Closely connected with this is the fact that more and more the fundamental principle of the method of mathematics is being shown to be inadequate, and the much admired evidence of mathematics is being shown to need critique and methodological reform. The crisis of foundations, **<p. 33>** which today has gripped all the positive sciences, also and most noticeably concerns the pure mathematical sciences that are the foundations of the exact sciences of nature. The conflict over the "paradoxes" – that is, over the legitimate or illusory evidence of the basic concepts of set theory, arithmetic, geometry and the pure theory of time, and also over the legitimacy of the empirical sciences of nature – instead of taking charge of these sciences and transforming them in terms of their requirements, has revealed that, as regards their whole methodological character, these sciences still **[p. 521]** cannot be accepted as sciences in the full and genuine sense: as sciences thoroughly transparent in their method and thus ready and able to completely justify each methodical step.

Thus the realization of Leibniz' design of rationally grounding *all* positive sciences by developing all the corresponding *a priori* sciences does not yet mean that the empirical sciences have achieved an adequate rationality, especially when these *a priori* sciences themselves are developed only on the basis of the evidence of naïve positivity – after the fashion of geometry, for example. The genuine basic concepts of all positive sciences, those from which all

[14] *Hu* IX, pp. 520.34–521.27 (= C3 pp. 32.24– 34.9). The material generally corresponds to that of Draft D, III, §12, from which we take the title.

scientific concepts of the real must be built up, are necessarily the basic concepts of the corresponding *a priori* sciences as well. When a method based entirely on insight lacks the legitimate formation in which the knowledge of its genuine and necessary sense is founded, then that unclarity is transmitted to the entire *a priori* and then to the entire theoretical store of the empirical sciences.

Only by way of phenomenological reform can modern **<p. 34>** sciences be liberated from their intolerable situation. Of course, Leibniz' fundamental demand for the creation of all the *a priori* sciences remains correct. But that entails discovering the idea of a universal ontology, and this discovery must be essentially complemented by the knowledge that any ontology drawn from natural positivity essentially lacks self-sufficiency and methodological completeness, which come from the nexus of the only absolutely self-sufficient and absolutely universal phenomenology.

[The Phenomenological Grounding of Factual Sciences, and Empirical Phenomenology][15]

As the ontological disciplines are being reshaped into concretely complete constitutive ontologies, likewise the whole radical method that positivity necessarily lacks is created with insight. Indeed, in its universality, transcendental phenomenology thematically comprises all conceivable performances that take place in subjectivity; it encompasses not just all habitual attitudes and all formations of unity constituted in them but also the natural attitude with its straightforwardly existent world of experience and the corresponding positive sciences, empirical as well as *a priori*, related to that world. But transcendental phenomenology is concerned with and deals with these and all formations of unity along with the constituting manifolds. Thus, within its systematic theories [and] its universal *a priori* of all possible contents of transcendental subjectivity, the entire *a priori* accessible to the natural attitude must be comprised, established not in some crude, straightforward fashion but rather always along with the *a priori* of its appurtenant transcendental constitution. And that means: along with the method for its production, whether that method be incomplete or, in the case of complete formation, **<p. 35>** endowed with rational insight.

Let us clarify this for ourselves in a few steps. The concrete thematic **[p. 522]** field of all positive empirical sciences is the world of real things. In accordance with the universal structures of these things, there is a division of

---

[15] *Hu* IX, pp. 521.27–525.40 (= C3 pp. 34.9–41.19). The material generally corresponds (at great length) to that of Draft D, III, §13, from which we derive this title.

sciences or groups of sciences, with their essentially different [focuses]. Such structures mark off, for example, nature and the spiritual realm of the psychical; and within nature they mark off, for example, space and time as either separated from or bound to the universal structures under consideration. Pure research into nature or pure research into psyches is abstractive to the degree that it stays exclusively within the universal structures of that one particular science and leaves untouched those structures in which the two intertwine. Rational science, as science based on principled – that is, *a priori* – insights into structures, demands knowledge of the concrete full *a priori* of the world, i.e., the exhibition of the world's essential total form, with the universal structures belonging to it, and finally, for each one of these structures, the exhibition of the partial forms included within it. Thus, for example, one must work out [on the one hand] the whole *a priori* formal system that rules all possible formations of natural data insofar as they should and always can belong to the unity of a possible nature; or, on the other hand, the possible formations of the psychic that should belong to the unity of a possible psyche – and, at a higher level, of a community of psyches – and that should be able to be "co-possible" in it.

The method for attaining an *a priori* of any level of forms whatsoever is, as regards universality, always the same. The method for [attaining] the psychological *a priori* has already been indicated above. The *facta* that serve in any given case as **<p. 36>** the starting point of the experience become, as such, "irrelevant"; freely varied in imagination, they become the starting points of an open-ended series of imaginative transformations that are to be freely pursued with awareness of their open-endedness (the "and so forth"). The comprehending gaze is now directed to the stable form that stands out in the course of these optional variations – to this form as the essential structure that, in this optional, open-ended variation, stands out in the consciousness of its unbreakableness, its necessary apodictic invariance. In this way, within the factual experiential world or world-structure, or within individual factually experienced realities, one comes to recognize that [element] without which any conceivable world at all, any conceivable thing at all, etc., would be unthinkable.

Like any activity with a justified goal, this one too requires knowledge of essence if it is to be a rational activity. It requires critique of and therefore reflection on its method and then possibly a transformation of its method in the sense of an evidential justification of the goal and the path. A basic and pre-eminent element of method has to do with possible experience itself through which one gets those possibilities of objects of experience that function as variants. Imaginative variation, on which the knowledge of essence rests, should yield concrete, real possibilities – for example, things that possibly exist. Therefore, that by means of which things become represented

cannot be a mere imaginative variation of the current individual perceptual appearances. **[p. 523]** Every possible individual perception makes a presumption regarding the being and the being-thus-and-so of the possibly perceived thing; it gives only one side of the thing, but imbued with the undetermined presumption of certain other sides that presumably are accessible in new possible experiences. How do one-sidedness and many-sidedness become all-sidedness? What form must the flow of possible experiences have in which the concretely full thing is to come to intuition as an existent entity without (and this is an open possibility) getting turned into an empty illusion? **<p. 37>**

Therefore, for knowledge of essence to be adjudged genuine and normatively formed, what is needed is a systematic study of the phenomenological constitution of possible realities – and of the world itself that encompasses them all – in the manifolds of possible experience. Or, as one might also put it: we need a theory of experiential "reason." And yet another thing: The *a priori* of a possible world is a theoretical, predictively formed *a priori*. Only in this way does it acquire the form of an objective truth, i.e., one that is intersubjectively utilizable, verifiable, documentable. In this regard new basic elements of method are required: a disclosure of the paths of "logical" reason as well as of experiential reason. On the one hand, the need arises for a higher-level *a priori* that relates to the ideal objectivities emerging under the rubrics of "judgment" and "truth." We need a doctrine of the forms of possible predicative formations (judgments) – both individual ones and those to be connected synthetically and in mutual feelings – in particular a doctrine of the forms of possible true judgments, and finally of those open-ended systems of truth that, synthetically related to a unified region, are called sciences (understood as unities of theory). [On the other hand,] correlative to this [we need] a formal doctrine of manifolds whose theme is the formal idea of a region as thought by means of, and formally to be determined by, mere forms of truth.

The formal logic just described, taken in the broadest sense of a *mathesis universalis* that includes all analytically mathematical disciplines of our time, is itself a positive science, only of a higher level. Nonetheless, because the new irreal objectivities – judgments, truth, theories, manifolds **<p. 38>** – are for their part subjectively constituted and require a rational method (a method of evidential formation) in order to be comprehended, for that reason we come to new strata of phenomenological research that are requisite for a genuine scientific ontology. Phenomenology is itself a science, it too fashions predicative theories, and it becomes evident that logical generality governs all such theories whatever – and in that way one side of the thoroughly self-referential nature of phenomenology is revealed. An *a priori* does arise already, one that is naïvely practiced prior to such universal reflections on what is required, one that stands out in subjective certitude (e.g., as a geometric *a priori*). But as a vaguely grasped *a priori*, it is subject to misunderstandings **[p. 524]** regarding

its actually necessary content and its import. Up to a certain point a science, like any other goal-oriented undertaking, can be successful even if it is not completely clear about basic principles of method. But the proper sense of science nonetheless entails the possibility of a radical justification of all its steps and not just a superficial reflection and critique. Its highest ideal has always been the complete justification of every one of its methodological steps from apodictic principles that, in turn, have to be justified for all times and all people. Finally, the development of *a priori* disciplines was itself to serve the method of scientific knowledge of the world, and all of this would have been true of a universal ontology, if one had been developed in fulfillment of Leibniz' *desideratum*. But as we see, every *a priori* itself requires in turn a radical methodological **<p. 39>** justification, specifically within a phenomenology that encompasses all *a priori* correlation.

Thus it is that the crises in the foundations of all the positive sciences that are striving to advance indicate, and make understandable, the necessities of research into the methods of those sciences. Although these sciences still are not clear on it, they lack the method for the apodictic formation and justification of the methods whence they are supposed to derive their unassailable basic concepts and ultimate foundations with an evidence that leaves absolutely no room for obscurity about their legitimate sense and import. Such evidence cannot be acquired naïvely nor can it be one that merely is "felt" in naïve activity. Rather, it can be acquired only by means of a phenomenological disclosure of certain structures of experiential and logical reason, structures that come into question for the respective basic concepts – that is, by means of very painstaking and thoroughly developed phenomenological research.

To be sure, this research could have first taken place as purely psychological research – if, among the *a priori* sciences, a pure psychology had already been developed. But then one could not have just stopped at that point. For, as has become clear from our presentation, the consistent development of the idea of such a psychology carries with it a strong incentive for awakening the transcendental problem and thus for the awareness that an ultimately grounded cognition can only be a transcendental cognition.

At this point it becomes clear that the full elaboration of the problematic of the foundations of the positive sciences and of their inherent tendency to transform themselves into radically genuine sciences – completely self-transparent and absolutely self-justifying in their cognitive achievements – **<p. 40>** leads, first of all, to the projection (within a complete system of *a priori* disciplines) of the total *a priori* of the factual world as a world in general, and, in conjunction with that, the projection of the complete system of the possible disciplines of a *mathesis universalis* understood as the most broadly conceived formal logic; and then leads to the transformation of all these disciplines into **[p. 525]** phenomenologically grounded ones and therewith it lets them emerge

in radically genuine form as branches of an absolute and absolutely universal ontology that is the same as fully developed transcendental phenomenology. This latter is itself the ultimate science, the one that, in justifying itself, is referred back to itself. From it we manage, with consistent progress, to achieve a necessary broadening of the idea of universal phenomenology into the idea of the absolutely universal science that unites in itself all cognitions, both eidetic and empirical.

The universal *a priori* includes all the possibilities of *empeiria* in general and thus all possible empirical sciences – as ideal possibilities. Thus the sciences that treat the *factum* of this experiential world have their essential form entirely – on both the noetic and the noematic-ontic sides – pre-indicated by this universal ontology; and they are genuine sciences only in their being referred back to this form. By the transformation of positive ontology into transcendental ontology and with the grounding of positive empirical sciences on transcendental ontology, the positive empirical sciences are transformed into phenomenologically understood sciences, sciences of factually transcendental subjectivity, along with everything which that subjectivity accepts as "in being." So the end-result is also an empirical, factual-scientific phenomenology. Ideally developed, it is present **<p. 41>** in the system of all positive empirical sciences that are brought to the status of radical scientificity on the basis of eidetic phenomenology.

In this manner eidetic phenomenology is the necessarily first phenomenology that must be grounded and systematically carried through, whereas the rationalization of the factual sciences, the initial form of which is necessarily more or less naïve, is the second [task]. The complete system of these rationalized empirical sciences is itself empirical-scientific phenomenology. This means that eidetic phenomenology is the method whereby factual transcendental subjectivity comes to its universal self-knowledge, to a rational, completely transparent self-knowledge in which subjectivity perfectly understands both itself and whatever it accepts as in being. Universal and ultimate science is absolute science of the spirit. Like all culture, eidetic phenomenology as science resides in factual transcendental subjectivity, produced by that subjectivity and for it so that it may understand itself and thereby understand the world as constituted in it.

[The "Ultimate and Highest" Problems as Phenomenological][16]

The universality of phenomenology manifestly encompasses all conceivable scientific problems; it is within subjectivity that all questions receive their sense, which is always the sense that they can have for subjectivity. In it is carried out the separation of rational from irrational questions and thus ultimately the separation of scientific from pseudo-scientific questions. All groups of problems, however they be gathered under the particular title of philosophy, are included within phenomenology according to their genuine sense and method. Thus, of course, **[p. 526]** questions about the "sense" of history or **<p. 42>** the "theory of historical knowledge" are also included, that is, questions about the methods for "understanding" individual facts of the personal world – methods that are to be formed from the corresponding *a priori* sources through apodictic insight. Likewise phenomenology takes in the totality of rational praxis and every categorial form of the practical environment that goes with such praxis. To know is not to value in one's heart and to shape according to values (so far as the goals of cognition are not themselves valued as goals and striven for), but every performance of a valuing and a willing intentionality can be turned into a cognitive one and produces objects[17] for cognition and science. Thus all forms of the spiritualization of nature with some kind of ideal sense – especially all forms of culture in correlation with culture-producing persons – become themes for science, [and the same holds], in highest universality, for the whole of the life of striving and willing with its problematic of practical reason, the absolute ought, and so on. Here belongs the task of clarifying the striving for true and genuine humanity, a striving that belongs essentially to the personal being and life of humankind (in the transcendental sense of this word).

Only in universality do all such problems get their full significance and their evidential method. Any one-sidedness or isolation of philosophical problems – which are always and without exception universal problems – takes its revenge through unintelligibility. By being referred back to itself, phenomenology, taken in its fully developed idea, clarifies its own function. In phenomenology as absolutely universal science, there is achieved the universal self-reflection of humankind. Its results, growing in scope and perfection, its theories and disciplines, are ultimately **<p. 43>** called upon to regulate, with insight, a genuine life for humanity. As regards metaphysics, phenomenological philosophy is anti-metaphysical only in the sense that it rejects every metaphysics that draws on extra-scientific sources and engages in high-flown

---

[16] *Hu* IX, pp. 525.40–526.36 (= C3 pp. 41.20–43.8). The material generally corresponds to that of Draft D, III, §15, from which we take this title.

[17] *"Themen."*

hypothesizing. But the old metaphysical tradition and its genuine problems must be placed on the transcendental level where they find their pure formulation and the phenomenological methodology for their solution.

[Complete Phenomenology as All-embracing Philosophy][18]

The full development of the idea of a universal phenomenology leads precisely back to the old concept of philosophy as the universal and absolute – i.e., completely justified – science. Here the conviction that dominated Descartes' philosophy gets confirmed for essential reasons: his conviction that a genuinely grounded individual science is possible only as a branch of *sapientia universalis*, the one and only universal science, whose idea, developed in pure evidence, must guide all genuine cognitive endeavors.[19]

[18] *Hu* IX, p. 526.36–44 (= C3 p. 43.8–17). This material corresponds to some of that of Draft D, §14, from which we take the title.

[19] Husserl took the remainder of Draft C (pp. 43.18–45.18 into Draft D, where he made it §16. (*Hu* IX, p. 526, n. 1)

EDMUND HUSSERL

"PHENOMENOLOGY"
ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA ARTICLE

DRAFT D

Translated by Richard E. Palmer

<Introduction>

The term "phenomenology" designates two things: a new kind of descriptive method which made a breakthrough in philosophy at the turn of the century, and an a priori science derived from it, a science which is intended to supply the basic instrument (*Organon*) for a rigorously scientific philosophy and in its consequent application, to make possible a methodical reform of all the sciences. Together with this philosophical phenomenology, but not yet separated from it, however, there also came into being a new psychological discipline parallel to it in method and content: the *a priori* pure or "phenomenological" psychology, which raises the reformational claim to being the basic methodological foundation on which alone a scientifically rigorous empirical psychology can be established. An outline of this psychological phenomenology, standing nearer to our natural thinking, is well suited to serve as a preliminary step that will lead up to an understanding of philosophical phenomenology.

I. PURE PSYCHOLOGY: ITS FIELD OF EXPERIENCE, ITS METHOD, AND ITS FUNCTION

§1. Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology.

Modern psychology is the science dealing with the "psychical"[1] in the concrete context of spatio-temporal realities, being in some way so to speak what occurs in nature as egoical, with all that inseparably belongs to it as psychic processes like experiencing, thinking, feeling, willing, as capacity, and as *habitus*. Experience presents the psychical as merely a stratum of human and animal being. Accordingly, psychology is seen as a branch of the more concrete science of anthropology, or rather zoology. Animal realities are first of all, at a basic level, physical realities. As such, they belong in the closed nexus of relationships in physical nature, in Nature meant in the primary and most pregnant sense as the universal theme of a pure natural science; that is to say, an objective science of nature which in deliberate onesidedness excludes all extra-physical predications of reality. The scientific investigation of the bodies of animals fits within this area. By contrast, however, if the psychical aspect of the animal world is to become the topic of investigation, the first thing we have to ask is how far, in parallel with the pure science of nature, a pure psychology is possible. Obviously, purely psychological research can be done to a certain extent. To it we owe the basic concepts of the psychical according to the properties essential and specific to it. These concepts must be incorporated into the others, into the psychophysical foundational concepts of psychology.

It is by no means clear from the very outset, however, how far the idea of a pure psychology – as a psychological discipline sharply separate in itself and as a parallel to the pure physical science of nature – has a meaning that is legitimate and necessary of realization.

§2. The Purely Mental in Self-Experience and Community Experience. The Universal Description of Intentional Experiences.

To establish and unfold this guiding idea, the first thing that is necessary is a clarification of what is peculiar to experience, and especially to the pure experience of the psychical – and specifically the purely psychical that experi-

[1] Or, simply the "mental." Because of the associations in English of the "psychic" with spiritualism and telepathy, *das Psychische* could perhaps better be translated simply as the "mental" and adjectival variants like *psychische* as "mental." But since in previous published versions of this translation, I used "psychical" and "psychic," and this rendering is used by other translators and by Sheehan in the first three drafts of this Article, I will continue this more technical rendering.

ence reveals, which is to become the theme of a pure psychology. It is natural and appropriate that precedence will be accorded to the most immediate types of experience, which in each case reveal to us our own psychic being.

Focussing our experiencing gaze on our own psychic life necessarily takes place as reflection, as a turning about of a glance which had previously been directed elsewhere. Every experience can be subject to such reflection, as can indeed every manner in which we occupy ourselves with any real or ideal objects – for instance, thinking, or in the modes of feeling and will, valuing and striving. So when we are fully engaged in conscious activity, we focus exclusively on the specific thing, thoughts, values, goals, or means involved, but not on the psychic experience as such, in which these things are known as such. Only reflection reveals this to us. Through reflection, instead of grasping simply the matter straight-out – the values, goals, and instrumentalities – we grasp the corresponding subjective experiences in which we become conscious of them, in which (in the broadest sense) they "appear." For this reason, they are called "phenomena," and their most general essential character is to exist as the "consciousness-of" or "appearance-of" the specific things, thoughts (judged states of affairs, grounds, conclusions), plans, decisions, hopes, and so forth. This relatedness [of the appearing to the object of appearance] resides in the meaning of all expressions in the vernacular languages which relate to a psychic process – for instance, perception *of* something, recalling of something, thinking of something, hoping *for* something, fearing something, striving *for* something, deciding on something, and so on. If this realm of what we call "phenomena" proves to be the possible field for a pure psychological discipline related exclusively to phenomena, we can understand the designation of it as *phenomenological psychology*. The terminological expression, deriving from Scholasticism, for designating the basic character of being as consciousness, as consciousness of something, is *intentionality*. In unreflective holding of some object or other in consciousness, we are turned or directed towards it: our "*intentio*" goes out towards it. The phenomenological reversal of our gaze shows that this "being directed" [*Gerichtetsein*] is really an immanent essential feature of the respective experiences involved; they are "intentional" experiences.

An extremely large and variegated number of kinds of special cases fall within the general scope of this concept. Consciousness of something is not an empty holding of something; every phenomenon has its own total form of intention [*intentionale Gesamtform*], but at the same time it has a structure, which in intentional analysis leads always again to components which are themselves also intentional. So, for example, in starting from a perception of something (for example, a die), phenomenological reflection leads to a multiple and yet synthetically unified intentionality. There are continually varying differences in the modes of appearing of objects, which are caused by the

changing of "orientation" – of right and left, nearness and farness, with the consequent differences in perspective involved. There are further differences in appearance between the "actually seen front" and the "unseeable" ["*unanschaulichen*"] and the relatively "undetermined" reverse side, which is nevertheless "meant along with it." Observing the flux of modes of appearing and the manner of their "synthesis," one finds that every phase and portion [of the flux] is already in itself "consciousness-of" – but in such a manner that there is formed within the constant emerging of new phases the synthetically unified awareness that this is one and the same object. The intentional structure of any process of perception has its fixed essential type [*seine feste Wesenstypik*], which must necessarily be realized in all its extraordinary complexity just in order for a physical body simply to be perceived as such. If this same thing is intuited in other modes – for example, in the modes of recollection, fantasy or pictorial representation – to some extent the whole intentional content of the perception comes back, but all aspects peculiarly transformed to correspond to that mode. This applies similarly for every other category of psychic process: the judging, valuing, striving consciousness is not an empty having knowledge of the specific judgments, values, goals, and means. Rather, these constitute themselves, with fixed essential forms corresponding to each process, in a flowing intentionality. For psychology, the universal task presents itself: to investigate systematically the elementary intentionalities, and from out of these [unfold] the typical forms of intentional processes, their possible variants, their syntheses to new forms, their structural composition, and from this advance towards a descriptive knowledge of the totality of psychic process, towards a comprehensive type of a life of the psyche [*Gesamttypus eines Lebens der Seele*]. Clearly, the consistent carrying out of this task will produce knowledge which will have validity far beyond the psychologist's own particular psychic existence.

Mental life is accessible to us not only through self-experience but also through the experience of others. This novel source of experience offers us not only what matches our self-experience but also what is new, inasmuch as, in terms of consciousness and indeed as experience, it establishes the differences between own and other, as well as the properties peculiar to the life of a community. At just this point there arises the task of also making the psychic life of the community, with all the intentionalities that pertain to it, phenomenologically understandable.

§3. The Self-Contained Field of the Purely Mental. – Phenomenological Reduction and Genuine Experience of Something Internal.

The idea of a phenomenological psychology encompasses the whole range of tasks arising out of the experience of self and the experience of the other founded on it. But it is not yet clear whether phenomenological experience, followed through in exclusiveness and consistency, really provides us with a kind of closed-off field of being, out of which a science can grow which is exclusively focussed on it and completely free of everything psychophysical. Here [in fact] difficulties do exist, which have hidden from psychologists the possibility of such a purely phenomenological psychology even after Brentano's discovery of intentionality. They are relevant already to the construction of a really pure self-experience, and therewith of a really pure psychic datum. A particular method of access is required for the pure phenomenological field: the method of "phenomenological reduction." This *method of "phenomenological reduction"* is thus the foundational method of pure psychology and the presupposition of all its specifically theoretical methods. Ultimately the great difficulty rests on the way that already the self-experience of the psychologist is everywhere intertwined with external experience, with that of extra-psychical real things. The experienced "exterior" does not belong to one's intentional interiority, although certainly the experience itself belongs to it as experience-*of* the exterior. Exactly this same thing is true of every kind of awareness directed at something out there in the world. A consistent epoché of the phenomenologist is required, if he wishes to break through to his own consciousness as pure phenomenon or as the totality of his purely psychic processes. That is to say, in the accomplishment of phenomenological reflection he must inhibit every co-accomplishment of objective positing produced in unreflective consciousness, and therewith [inhibit] every judgmental drawing-in of the world as it "exists" for him straightforwardly. The specific experience of this house, this body, of a world as such, is and remains, however, according to its own essential content and thus inseparably, experience "of this house," this body, this world; this is so for every mode of consciousness which is directed towards an object. It is, after all, quite impossible to describe an intentional experience – even if illusionary, an invalid judgment, or the like – without at the same time describing the object of that consciousness as such. The universal epoché of the world as it becomes known in consciousness (the "putting it in parentheses") shuts out from the phenomenological field the world as it exists for the subject in simple absoluteness; its place, however, is taken by the world as given in *consciousness* (perceived, remembered, judged, thought, valued, etc.) – the world *as such*, the "world in parentheses," or in other words, the world, or rather individual things in the world as absolute, are replaced by the respective meaning of each in *consciousness* [*Bewußt-*

seinssinn] in its various modes (perceptual meaning, recollected meaning, and so on).

With this, we have clarified and supplemented our initial determination of the phenomenological experience and its sphere of being. In going back from the unities posited in the natural attitude to the manifold of modes of consciousness in which they appear, the unities, as inseparable from these multiplicities – but as "parenthesized" – are also to be reckoned among what is purely psychical, and always specifically in the appearance-character in which they present themselves. The method of phenomenological reduction (to the pure "phenomenon," the purely psychical) accordingly consists (1) in the methodical and rigorously consistent epoché of every objective positing in the psychic sphere, both of the individual phenomenon and of the whole psychic field in general; and (2) in the methodically practiced seizing and describing of the multiple "appearances" as appearances of their objective units and these units as units of component meanings accruing to them each time in their appearances. With this is shown a two-fold direction – the *noetic* and *noematic* of phenomenological description. Phenomenological experience in the methodical form of the phenomenological reduction is the only genuine "inner experience" in the sense meant by any well-grounded science of psychology. In its own nature lies manifest the possibility of being carried out continuously in infinitum with methodical preservation of purity. The reductive method is transferred from self-experience to the experience of others insofar as there can be applied to the envisaged [*vergegenwärtigten*] psychic life of the Other the corresponding parenthesizing and description according to the subjective "how" of its appearance and what is appearing ("noesis" and "noema"). As a further consequence, the community that is experienced in community experience is reduced not only to the psychically particularized intentional fields but also to the unity of the community life that connects them all together, the community psychic life in its phenomenological purity (intersubjective reduction). Thus results the perfect expansion of the genuine psychological concept of "inner experience."

To every mind there belongs not only the unity of its multiple *intentional life-process* [*intentionalen Lebens*] with all its inseparable unities of sense directed towards the "object." There is also, inseparable from this life-process, the experiencing *ego-subject* as the identical *ego-pole* giving a centre for all specific intentionalities, and as the carrier of all habitualities growing out of this life-process. Likewise, then, the reduced intersubjectivity, in pure form and concretely grasped, is a community of pure "persons" acting in the intersubjective realm of the pure life of consciousness.

§4. Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as an Eidetic Science

To what extent does the unity of the field of phenomenological experience assure the possibility of a psychology exclusively based on it, thus a pure phenomenological psychology? It does not automatically assure an empirically pure science of *facts* from which everything psychophysical is abstracted. But this situation is quite different with an *apriori* science. In it, every self-enclosed field of possible experience permits *eo ipso* the all-embracing transition from the factual to the essential form, the *eidos*. So here, too. If the phenomenological actual fact as such becomes irrelevant; if, rather, it serves only as an example and as the foundation for a free but intuitive variation of the factual mind and communities of minds *into* the a priori possible (thinkable) ones; and if now the theoretical eye directs itself to the necessarily enduring invariant in the variation, then there will arise with this systematic way of proceeding a realm of its own, of the "apriori." There emerges therewith the eidetically necessary typical form, the *eidos;* this *eidos* must manifest itself throughout all the potential forms of psychic being in particular cases, must be present in all the synthetic combinations and self-enclosed wholes, if it is to be at all "thinkable," that is, intuitively conceivable. Phenomenological psychology in this manner undoubtedly must be established as an "eidetic phenomenology"; it is then exclusively directed toward the invariant essential forms. For instance, the phenomenology of perception of bodies will not be [simply] a report on the factually occurring perceptions or those to be expected; rather it will be the presentation of invariant structural systems without which perception of a body and a synthetically concordant multiplicity of perceptions of one and the same body as such would be unthinkable. If the phenomenological reduction contrived a means of access to the phenomenon of real and also potential inner experience, the method founded in it of "eidetic reduction" provides the means of access to the invariant essential structures of the total sphere of pure psychic process.

§5. The Fundamental Function of Pure Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Psychology

A phenomenological pure psychology is absolutely necessary as the foundation for the building up of an "exact" empirical psychology, which since its modern beginnings has been sought according to the model of the exact pure sciences of physical nature. The fundamental meaning of "exactness" in this natural science lies in its being founded on an apriori form-system – each part

unfolded in a special theory (pure geometry, a theory of pure time, theory of motion, etc.) – for a Nature conceivable in these terms. It is through the utilization of this apriori form-system for factual nature that the vague, inductive empirical approach attains to a share of eidetic necessity [*Wesensnotwendigkeit*] and empirical natural science itself gains a new sense – that of working out for all vague concepts and rules their indispensable basis of rational concepts and laws. As essentially differentiated as the methods of natural science and psychology may remain, there does exist a necessary common ground: that psychology, like every science, can only draw its "rigor" ("exactness") from the rationality of that which is in accordance with its essence. The uncovering of the a priori set of types without which "I," "we," "consciousness," "the objectivity of consciousness," and therewith psychic being as such, would be inconceivable – with all the essentially necessary and essentially possible forms of synthesis which are inseparable from the idea of a whole comprised of individual and communal psychic life – produces a prodigious field of exactness that can immediately (without the intervening link of *Limes-Idealisierung* [apparently meaning idealization to exact, mathematical limits]) be carried over into research on the psyche. Admittedly, the phenomenological apriori does not comprise the complete a priori of psychology, inasmuch as the psychophysical relationship as such has its own apriori. It is clear, however, that this apriori will presuppose that of a pure phenomenological psychology, just as, on the other side, it will presuppose the pure apriori of a physical (and specifically the organic) Nature as such.

The systematic construction of a phenomenological pure psychology demands:

(1) The description of the peculiarities universally belonging to the essence of an intentional psychic process, which includes the most general law of synthesis: every connection of consciousness with consciousness gives rise to a consciousness.

(2) The exploration of single forms of intentional psychic processes which in essential necessity generally must or can present themselves in the mind; in unity with this, also the exploration of the syntheses they are members of for a typology of their essences: both those that are discrete and those continuous with others, both the finitely closed and those continuing into open infinity.

(3) The showing and eidetic description [*Wesensdeskription*] of the total structure [*Gesamtgestalt*] of psychic life as such; in other words, a description of the essential character [*Wesensart*] of a universal "stream of consciousness."

(4) The term "I" [or "ego"] designates a new direction for investigation (still in abstraction from the social sense of this word) in reference to the essence-forms of "habituality"; in other words, the "I" [or "ego"] as subject of lasting beliefs or thought-tendencies – "persuasions" – (convictions about

being, value-convictions, volitional decisions, and so on), as the personal subject of habits, of trained knowing, of certain character qualities.

Throughout all this, the "static" description of essences ultimately leads to problems of genesis, and to an all-pervasive genesis that governs the whole life and development of the personal "I" [or "ego"] according to eidetic laws [*eidetischen Gesetzen*]. So on top of the first "static phenomenology" will be constructed in higher levels a dynamic or genetic phenomenology. As the first and founding genesis it will deal with that of passivity – genesis in which the "I" [or "ego"] does not actively participate. Here lies the new task, an all-embracing eidetic phenomenology of association, a latter-day rehabilitation of David Hume's great discovery, involving an account of the a priori genesis out of which a real spatial world constitutes itself for the mind in habitual acceptance. There follows from this the eidetic theory dealing with the development of personal habituality, in which the purely psychic "I" [or "ego"] within the invariant structural forms of consciousness exists as personal "I" and is conscious of itself in habitual continuing being and as always being transformed. For further investigation, there offers itself an especially interconnected stratum at a higher level: the static and then the genetic phenomenology of reason.

II. PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY

§6. Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Locke's Psychologism

The idea of a purely phenomenological psychology does not have just the function described above, of reforming empirical psychology. For deeply rooted reasons, it can also serve as a preliminary step for laying open the essence of a transcendental phenomenology. Historically, this idea too did not grow out of the needs peculiar to psychology itself. Its history leads us back to John Locke's notable basic work, and the significant development in Berkeley and Hume of the impetus it contained. Already Locke's restriction to the purely subjective was determined by extra-psychological interests: psychology here stood in the service of the transcendental problem awakened through Descartes. In Descartes' Meditations, the thought that had become the guiding one for "first philosophy" was that all of "reality," and finally the whole world of what exists and is so for us, exists only as the presentational content of our presentations, as meant in the best case and as evidently reliable in our own cognitive life. This is the motivation for all transcendental problems, genuine or false. Descartes' method of doubt was the first method of exhibiting "transcendental subjectivity," and his ego cogito led to its first conceptual

formulation. In Locke, Descartes' transcendentally pure *mens* is changed into the "human mind," whose systematic exploration through inner experience Locke tackled out of a transcendental-philosophical interest. And so he is the founder of psychologism as a transcendental philosophy on the basis of a psychology of inner experience. The fate of scientific philosophy hangs on the radical overcoming of every trace of psychologism, an overcoming which not only exposes the fundamental absurdity of psychologism but also does justice to its transcendentally significant kernel of truth. The sources of its continuous historical power are drawn from out of a double sense [an ambiguity] of all the concepts of the subjective, which arises as soon as the transcendental question is broached. The uncovering of this ambiguity involves [us in the need for] at once the sharp separation, and at the same time the parallel treatment, of pure phenomenological psychology (as the scientifically rigorous form of a psychology purely of inner experience) and transcendental phenomenology as true transcendental philosophy. At the same time this will justify our advance discussion of psychology as the means of access to true philosophy. We will begin with a clarification of the true transcendental problem, which in the initially obscure unsteadiness of its sense makes one so very prone (and this applies already to Descartes) to shunt it off to a side track.

§7. The Transcendental Problem

To the essential sense of the transcendental problem belongs its all-inclusiveness, in which it places in question the world and all the sciences investigating it. It arises within a general reversal of that "*natural attitude*" in which everyday life as a whole as well as the positive sciences operate. In it [the natural attitude] the world is for us the self-evidently existing universe of realities which are continuously before us in unquestioned givenness. So this is the general field of our practical and theoretical activities. As soon as the theoretical interest abandons this natural attitude and in a general turning around of our regard directs itself to the life of consciousness – *in which* the "world" is for us precisely the world which is present *to us* – we find ourselves in a new cognitive attitude [or situation]. Every sense which the world has for us (which we have now become aware of), both its general indeterminate sense and its meaning as determined according to real particularities, is, within the internality of our own perceiving, imagining, thinking, and valuing life-process, a conscious sense, and a sense which is formed in our subjective genesis. Every acceptance of something as validly existing is brought about within us ourselves; and every evidence in experience and theory that establishes it is operative in us ourselves, habitually and continually motivating us.

The following applies to the world in every determination, even those that are self-evident: that what belongs *in and for itself* to the world, is how it is whether or not I, or whoever, become by chance aware of it or not. Once the world in this full, all-embracing universality has been related back to the subjectivity of consciousness, in whose living consciousness it makes its appearance precisely as "the world" in the sense it now has, then its whole mode of being acquires a dimension of unintelligibility or questionableness. This "making an appearance" [*Auftreten*], this being-for-us of the world as only subjectively having come to acceptance and only subjectively brought, and to be brought, to well-grounded evident presentation, requires clarification. Because of its empty generality, one's first awakening to the relatedness of the world to consciousness gives no understanding of how the varied life of consciousness, barely discerned and sinking back into obscurity, accomplishes such functions: how it, so to say, manages in its immanence that something which manifests itself can present itself as something existing in itself, and not only as something meant but as something authenticated in concordant experience. Obviously the problem extends to every kind of "ideal" world and its "being-in-itself" (for example, the world of pure numbers, or of "truths in themselves"). Unintelligibility is felt as a particularly telling affront to our very mode of being [as human beings]. For obviously we are the ones (individually and in community) in whose conscious life-process the real world which is present for us as such gains sense and acceptance. As human creatures, however, we ourselves are supposed to belong to the world. When we start with the sense of the world [*weltlichen Sinn*] given with our mundane existing, we are thus again referred back to ourselves and our conscious life-process as that wherein for us this sense is first formed. Is there conceivable here or anywhere another way of elucidating [it] than to interrogate consciousness itself and the "world" that becomes known in it? For it is precisely as meant by us, and from nowhere else than in us, that it has gained and can gain its sense and validity.

Next we take yet another important step, which will raise the "transcendental" problem (having to do with the being-sense of "transcendent" relative to consciousness) up to the final level. It consists in recognizing that the relativity of consciousness referred to just now applies not just to the brute fact of our world but in eidetic necessity to every conceivable world whatever. For if we vary our factual world in free fantasy, carrying it over into random conceivable worlds, we are implicitly varying ourselves whose environment the world is: in each case we change ourself into a possible subjectivity, whose environment would always have to be the world that was thought of, as a world of its [the subjectivity's] possible experiences, possible theoretical evidences, possible practical life. But obviously this variation leaves untouched the pure ideal worlds of the kind which have their existence in eidetic

univerality, which are in their essence invariable; it becomes apparent, however, from the possible variability of the subject knowing such identical essences [*Identitäten*], that their cognizability, and thus their intentional relatedness does not simply have to do with our de facto subjectivity. With this eidetic formulation of the problem, the kind of research into consciousness that is demanded is the eidetic.

§8. The Solution by Psychologism as a Transcendental Circle

Our distillation of the idea of a phenomenologically pure psychology has demonstrated the possibility of uncovering by consistent phenomenological reduction what belongs to the conscious subject's own essence in eidetic, universal terms, according to all its possible forms. This includes those forms of reason which establish and preserve laws, and therewith all forms of potentially appearing worlds, both those validated in themselves through concordant experiences and those whose truth is determined by means of theory. Accordingly, the systematic carrying through of this phenomenological psychology seems from the outset to encompass in itself in foundational (precisely, eidetic) universality the whole of correlation research on being and consciousness; thus it would seem to be the locus for all transcendental elucidation. On the other hand, we must not overlook the fact that psychology in all its empirical and eidetic disciplines remains a "positive science," a science operating within the natural attitude, in which the simply present world is the thematic ground. What it [psychology] wants to explore are the minds and communities of minds that are actually found in the world. The phenomenological reduction serves as psychological only to obtain the psychic aspect in animal realities in their own pure essential specificity and their own pure, specific interconnections. Even in eidetic research, then, the mind [or psyche] retains the sense of being which belongs in the realm of what is present in the world; it is merely related to possible real worlds. Even as eidetic phenomenologist, the psychologist is transcendentally naïve: he takes the possible "minds" (ego-subjects) completely in the relative sense of the word as those of men and animals considered purely and simply as present [*vorhanden*] in a possible spatial world. If, however, we allow the transcendental interest to be decisive instead of the natural-worldly interest, then psychology as a whole receives the stamp of what is transcendentally problematic because it can by no means supply the premises for a transcendental philosophy. The subjectivity of consciousness which is focussed on as psychical cannot be that to which we go back in transcendental questioning.

In order to arrive at insightful clarity on this decisive point, the thematic

sense of the transcendental question must be kept clearly in mind, and we must try to judge how, in keeping with it, the regions of the problematic and unproblematic are kept apart. The theme of transcendental philosophy is a concrete and systematic elucidation of those multiple intentional relationships which, in conformity with their essences, belong to any possible world whatever as the surrounding world of a corresponding possible subjectivity, for which it [the world] would be the one present as practically and theoretically accessible. In regard to all the objects and structures present in the world for these subjectivities, this accessibility involves the regulations of its possible conscious life which in their typology will have to be uncovered. Among such categories are "lifeless things," as well as men and animals with the internalities of their psychic life. From this starting point the full and complete sense of the being [*Seinsinn*] of a possible world, in general and in regard to all its constitutive categories, shall be elucidated. Like every meaningful question, this transcendental question presupposes a ground [*Boden*] of unquestionable being, in which all means of solution must be contained. Here, this ground is the subjectivity of that kind of conscious life in which a possible world, of whatever kind, is constituted as present. On the other hand, a self-evident basic requirement of any rational method is that this ground is presupposed as being beyond question is not confused with what the transcendental question, in its universality, puts into question. The realm of this questionability thus includes the whole realm of the transcendentally naïve and therefore every possible world simply claimed in the natural attitude. Accordingly, all positive sciences, and all their various areas of objects, are transcendentally to be subjected to an epoché. And psychology, also, and the entirety of what it considers the psychical [*das Psychische*, the mental]. Therefore it would be circular, a transcendental circle, to place the responsibility for the transcendental question on psychology, be it empirical or eidetic-phenomenological. We face at this point the paradoxical ambiguity: the subjectivity and consciousness to which the transcendental question recurs can thus really not be the subjectivity and consciousness with which psychology deals.

§9. The Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction and the Semblance of Transcendental Doubling

Are we, then, supposed to be dual beings – psychological, as human objectivities in the world, the subjects of psychic life, and at the same time transcendental, as the subjects of a transcendental, world-constituting life-process? This duality is clarified by means of evident demonstration. The psychic subjectivity, the concretely grasped "I" and "we" of ordinary conversation, is

learned about in its pure psychic ownness through the method of phenomenological-psychological reduction. In eidetic modification it provides the basis for a pure phenomenological psychology. Transcendental subjectivity, which is inquired into in the transcendental problem, and which is presupposed by the transcendental problem as an existing basis, is none other than again "I myself" and "we ourselves"; not, however, as found in the everyday natural attitude, or of positive science – *i.e.*, apperceived as components of the objectively present world before us – but rather as subjects of conscious life, *in* which this world and all that is present – for "us" – "makes" itself through certain apperceptions. As persons, mentally as well as bodily present in the world, we are for "ourselves"; we are appearances standing within an extremely variegated intentional life-process, "our" life, in which this being on hand constitutes itself "for us" apperceptively, with its entire sense-content. The (apperceived) I and we on hand presuppose an (apperceiving) I and we, for which they are on hand, which, however, is not itself present again in the same sense. To this transcendental subjectivity we have direct access through a transcendental experience. Just as psychic experience requires a reductive method for purity, so does the transcendental.

We would like to proceed here by introducing the "*transcendental reduction*" as built on the psychological reduction [or reduction of the psychical] – as an additional part of the purification which can be performed on it any time, a purification that is accomplished once more by means of a certain epoché. This is merely a consequence of the all-embracing epoché which belongs to the meaning of the transcendental question. If the transcendental relativity of every possible world demands an all-embracing parenthesizing, it also postulates the parenthesizing of pure psyches [*Seelen*, souls, minds] and the pure phenomenological psychology related to them. Through this parenthesizing they are transformed into transcendental phenomena. Thus, while the psychologist, operating within what for him is the naturally accepted world, reduces to pure psychic subjectivity the subjectivity occurring there (but still within the world), the transcendental phenomenologist, through his absolutely all-embracing epoché, reduces this psychologically pure element to transcendental pure subjectivity, [*i.e.*,] to that which performs and posits within itself the apperception of the world and therein the objectivating apperception of a "psyche [*Seele*] belonging to animal realities." For example, my actual current psychic processes of pure perception, fantasy, and so forth, are, in the attitude of positivity, psychological givens [or data] of psychological inner experience. They are transmuted into my transcendental psychic processes if through a radical epoché I posit them as mere phenomena of the world and my own human existence, and now focus on the intentional life-process wherein the entire apperception "of" the world, and in particular the apperception of my mind, my psychologically real perception-processes, and so forth, are formed.

The content of these processes, that which belongs to the individual essence of each, remains in all this fully preserved, although it is now visible as the core of an apperception practiced again and again psychologically but not previously considered. For the transcendental philosopher, who through a previous all-inclusive decision of his will has instituted in himself the habituality of this transcendental "parenthesizing," even the "mundanization" [*Verweltlichung*, treating everything as part of the world] of consciousness, which is omnipresent in the natural attitude, is inhibited once and for all. Accordingly, the consistent reflection on consciousness yields him time after time transcendentally pure data, and more particularly it is intuitive in the mode of a new kind of experience, transcendental "inner" experience. Arisen out of the methodical transcendental epoché, this new kind of "inner" experience opens up the limitless transcendental field of being. This is the parallel to the limitless psychological field. And the method of access [to its data] is the parallel to the purely psychological [method of access], that is, the psychological-phenomenological reduction. And again, the transcendental ego and the transcendental community of egos, conceived in the full concretion of transcendental life are the transcendental parallel to the I and we in the customary and psychological senses, concretely conceived as mind and community of minds, with the psychological life of consciousness that pertains to them. My transcendental ego is thus evidently "different" from the natural ego, but by no means as a second, as one separated from it in the natural sense of the word, just as on the contrary it is by no means bound up with it or intertwined with it, in the usual sense of these words. It is just the field of transcendental self-experience (conceived in full concreteness) which can in every case, through mere alteration of attitude, be changed into psychological self-experience. In this transition, an identity of the I is necessarily brought about; in transcendental reflection on this transition the psychological Objectivation becomes visible as self-objectivation of the transcendental ego, and so it is as if in every moment of the natural attitude the I finds itself with an apperception imposed upon it. If the parallelism of the transcendental and psychological experience-spheres has become comprehensible out of a mere alteration of attitude [or focus], as a kind of identity of the complex interpenetration of senses of being, then the consequence that results from it also becomes intelligible, namely the same parallelism and interpenetration of transcendental and psychological phenomenology implied in that interpenetration, whose whole theme is pure intersubjectivity in its dual meaning. Only in this case it has to be taken into account that the purely psychic intersubjectivity, as soon as it is subjected to the transcendental epoché, also leads to its parallel, that is, to transcendental intersubjectivity. Manifestly this parallelism spells nothing less than theoretical equivalence. Transcendental intersubjectivity is the concretely autonomous, absolute ground of being [*Seinsboden*] out of which everything tran-

scendent (and, with it, everything that belongs to the real world) obtains its existential sense as pertaining to something which only in a relative and therewith incomplete sense is an existing thing, namely as being an intentional unity which in truth exists from out of transcendental bestowal of sense, of harmonious confirmation, and from an habituality of lasting conviction that belongs to it by essential necessity.

§10. Pure Psychology as Propaedeutic to Transcendental Phenomenology

Through an elucidation of the essentially dual meaning of the subjectivity of consciousness, and also a clarification of the eidetic science to be directed to it, we begin to understand on very deep grounds the historical invincibility of psychologism. Its power resides in an *essential transcendental semblance* [*or illusion*] which, undisclosed, had to remain effective. Also, from this clarification we begin to understand on the one hand the independence of the idea of a transcendental phenomenology and the systematic developing of it from the idea of a phenomenological pure psychology, and yet on the other hand [we see] the propaedeutic usefulness of the preliminary project of a pure psychology for an ascent to transcendental phenomenology, a usefulness which has guided our discussion here. As regards this point [*i. e.*, the independence of the idea of transcendental phenomenology from that of a phenomenological pure psychology], clearly the phenomenological and eidetic reduction allow of being *immediately* connected to the disclosing of transcendental relativity, and in this way transcendental phenomenology arises directly out of transcendental intuition. In point of fact, this direct path was the historical path it took. Pure phenomenological psychology as eidetic science in positivity was simply not available. As regards the second point, *i.e.*, the propaedeutic preferability of the indirect approach to transcendental phenomenology through pure psychology, [it must be remembered that] the transcendental attitude involves such a change of focus from one's entire form of life-style, one which goes so completely beyond all previous experiencing of life, that it will, in virtue of its absolute strangeness, necessarily be difficult to understand. This is also true of a transcendental science. Phenomenological psychology, although also relatively new, and in its method of intentional analysis completely novel, still has the accessibility which is possessed by all positive sciences. Once this psychology has become clear, at least according to its sharply defined idea, then only the clarification of the true sense of the transcendental-philosophical field of problems and of the transcendental reduction is required in order for it to come into possession of transcendental phenomenology as merely a reversal of its doctrinal content into transcenden-

tal terms. The basic difficulties for penetrating into the terrain of the new phenomenology fall into these two steps [*Stufen*], namely that of understanding the true method of "inner experience," which already makes possible an "exact" psychology as a rational science of facts, and that of understanding the distinctive character of transcendental methods and questioning. True, simply regarded in itself, an interest in the transcendental is the highest and ultimate scientific interest, so it is entirely the right thing (it has been so historically and should continue) for transcendental theories to be cultivated in the autonomous, absolute system of transcendental philosophy, and to place before us, through showing the characteristic features of the natural in contrast to the transcendental attitude, the possibility within transcendental philosophy itself of reinterpreting all transcendental phenomenological doctrine [or theory] into doctrine [or theory] in the realm of natural positivity

III. Transcendental Phenomenology and Philosophy as Universal Science with Absolute Foundations

§11. Transcendental Phenomenology as Ontology

Remarkable consequences arise when one weighs the significance of transcendental phenomenology. In its systematic development, it brings to realization the Leibnizian idea of a universal ontology as the systematic unity of all conceivable a priori sciences, but on a new foundation which overcomes "dogmatism" through the use of the transcendental phenomenological method. Phenomenology as the science of all conceivable transcendental phenomena and especially the synthetic total structures in which alone they are concretely possible – those of the transcendental single subjects bound to communities of subjects is *eo ipso* the a priori science of all conceivable beings [*Seienden*]. But [it is the science], then, not merely of the totality of objectively existing beings taken in an attitude of natural positivity, but rather of the being as such in full concretion, which produces its sense of being and its validity through the correlative intentional constititution. It also deals with the being of transcendental subjectivity itself, whose nature it is to be demonstrably constituted transcendentally in and for itself. Accordingly, a phenomenology properly carried through is the truly universal ontology, as over against the only illusorily all-embracing ontology in positivity – and precisely for this reason it overcomes the dogmatic one-sidedness and hence the unintelligibility of the latter, while at the same time it comprises within itself the truly legitimate content [of an ontology in positivity] as grounded originally in intentional constitution.

§12. Phenomenology and the Crisis in the Foundations of the Exact Sciences

If we consider the how of this [transcendental element] is contained in it, we find that what this means is that every apriori is ultimately prescribed in its validity of being [precisely] *as* a transcendental accomplishment [*Leistung*]; *i.e.*, it occurs together with the essential structures of its constitution, with the kinds and levels of its givenness and confirmation of itself, and with the appertaining habitualities. This implies that in and through our diagnosis/determination of the apriori the subjective method of this determining is itself made clear, and that for the apriori disciplines which are founded within phenomenology (for example, as mathematical sciences) there can be no "paradoxes" and no "crises of the foundations." The consequence that arises [from all this] with reference to the apriori sciences that have already come into being historically and in transcendental naïveté is that only a radical, phenomenological grounding can transform them into true, methodical, fully self-justifying sciences. But precisely by this they will cease to be positive (dogmatic) sciences and become dependent branches of the one phenomenology as all-encompassing eidetic ontology.

§13. The Phenomenological Grounding of the Factual Sciences in Relation to Empirical Phenomenology

The unending task of setting forth the complete universe of the apriori in its transcendental relatedness back to itself [or self-reference], and thus in its self-sufficiency and perfect methodological clarity is itself a function of the method for achieving an all-embracing and hence fully grounded science of empirical fact. Genuine (relatively genuine) empirical science within the realm of] positivity demands the methodical establishing of a foundation [*Fundamentierung*] through a corresponding apriori science. If we take the universe of all possible empirical sciences whatever and demand a *radical* grounding that will be free from all "foundation crises," then we are led to the all-embracing apriori with a radical, and that is [and must be] *phenomenological*, grounding. The genuine form of an all-embracing science of facticity is thus the phenomenological [form], and as this it is the universal science of the factual transcendental intersubjectivity, [resting] on the methodical foundation of eidetic phenomenology as knowledge applying to any possible transcendental subjectivity whatever. Hence *the idea of an empirical phenomenology* which follows after the eidetic is understood and justified. It is identical with the complete systematic universe of the positive sciences, provided that we think of them from the beginning as absolutely grounded

methodologically through eidetic phenomenology.

§14. Complete Phenomenology as All-Embracing Philosophy

Precisely in this way the earliest and most original concept of philosophy is restored – as an all-embracing science based on radical self-justification, which in the ancient Platonic and again in the Cartesian sense is alone [truly] science. Phenomenology rigorously and systematically carried out, phenomenology in the broadened sense [which we have explained] above, is identical with this philosophy which encompasses *all* genuine knowledge. It is divided into eidetic phenomenology (or all-embracing ontology) as *first philosophy*, and *second philosophy*, the science of the universe of *facta*, or of the transcendental intersubjectivity that synthetically comprises all *facta*. First philosophy is the universe of methods for the second, and is related back into itself for its methodological grounding.

§15. The "Ultimate and Highest" Problems as Phenomenological

In phenomenology all rational problems have their place, and thus also those that traditionally are in some special sense or other philosophically significant. For the absolute sources of transcendental experience, or eidetic intuiting, only receive their genuine formulation and feasible means for their solution in phenomenology. In its universal relatedness back to itself, phenomenology recognizes its particular function within a potential transcendental life [or life-process] of humankind. Phenomenology recognizes the absolute norms which are to be picked out intuitively from it [that life or life-process], and also its primordial teleological-tendential structure in a directedness towards disclosure of these norms and their conscious practical operation. It recognizes itself as a function of the all-embracing self-reflection by (transcendental) humanity in the service of an all-inclusive praxis of reason that strives towards the universal ideal of absolute perfection which lies in the infinite, a striving that becomes free through disclosure. Or, in other words, it is a striving in the direction of the idea (lying in the infinite) of a humanness which is in action and continually wishes to live and be in truth and genuineness. In its self-reflective function it finds the relative realization of the correlated practical idea of a genuine human life [*Menschheitsleben*] in the second sense (whose structural forms of being and whose practical norms it is to investigate), namely as one [that is] consciously and purposively directed towards this absolute idea. In short, the metaphysically teleological, the ethi-

cal, and the problems of philosophy of history, no less than, obviously, the problems of judging reason, lie within its boundary, no differently from all significant problems whatever, and all [of them] in their inmost synthetic unity and order as transcendental spirituality [*Geistigkeit*].

§16. The Phenomenological Resolution of All Philosophical Antitheses

In the systematic work of phenomenology, which progresses from intuitively given [concrete] data to heights of abstraction, the old traditional ambiguous antitheses of the philosophical standpoint are resolved – by themselves and within the arts of an argumentative dialectic, and without weak efforts and compromises: oppositions such as between rationalism (Platonism) and empiricism, relativism and absolutism, subjectivism and objectivism, ontologism and transcendentalism, psychologism and anti-psychologism, positivism and metaphysics, or the teleological versus the causal interpretation of the world. Throughout all these, [one finds] justified motives, but also throughout half-truths or impermissible absolutizing of only relatively and abstractively legitimate one-sidednesses.

Subjectivism can only be overcome by the most all-embracing and consistent subjectivism (the transcendental). In this [latter] form it is at the same time objectivism [of a deeper sort], in that it represents the claims of whatever objectivity is to be demonstrated through concordant experience, but admittedly [this is an objectivism which] also brings out its full and genuine sense, against which [sense] the supposedly realistic objectivism sins by its failure to understand transcendental constitution. *Relativism* can only be overcome through the most all-embracing relativism, that of transcendental phenomenology, which makes intelligible the relativity of all "objective" being [or existence] as transcendentally constituted; but at one with this [it makes intelligible] the most radical relativity, the relatedness of the transcendental subjectivity to itself. But just this [relatedness, subjectivity] proves its identity to be the only possible sense of [the term] "absolute" being – over against all "objective" being that is relative to it – namely, as the "being for-itself" of transcendental subjectivity. Likewise: *Empiricism* can only be overcome by the most universal and consistent empiricism, which puts in place of the restricted [term] "experience" of the empiricists the necessarily broadened concept of experience [inclusive] of intuition which offers original data, an intuition which in all its forms (intuition of *eidos*, apodictic self-evidence, phenomenological intuition of essence, etc.) shows the manner and form of its legitimation through phenomenological clarification. Phenomenology as

eidetic is, on the other hand, rationalistic; it overcomes restrictive and dogmatic *Rationalism*, however, through the most universal rationalism of inquiry into essences, which is related uniformly to transcendental subjectivity, to the ego, consciousness, and conscious objectivity. And it is the same in reference to the other antitheses bound up with them. The tracing back of all being to transcendental subjectivity and its constitutive intentional functions leaves open, to mention one more point, no other way of contemplating the world than the *teleological*. And yet phenomenology also acknowledges a kernel of truth in *Naturalism* (or rather sensationism). That is, by revealing associations as intentional phenomena, indeed as a whole basic typology of forms of passive intentional synthesis with transcendental and purely passive genesis based on essential laws, phenomenology shows Humean fictionalism to contain anticipatory discoveries; particularly in his doctrine of the origin of such fictions as thing, persisting existence, causality – anticipatory discoveries all shrouded in absurd theories.

Phenomenological philosophy regards itself in its whole method as a pure outcome of methodical intentions which already animated Greek philosophy from its beginnings; above all, however, [it continues] the still vital intentions which reach, in the two lines of rationalism and empiricism, from Descartes through Kant and German idealism into our confused present day. A pure outcome of methodical intentions means real method which allows the problems to be taken in hand and completed. In the manner of true science this path is endless. Accordingly, phenomenology demands that the phenomenologist foreswear the ideal of a philosophic system and yet as a humble worker in community with others, live for a perennial philosophy [*philosophia perennis*].

DRAFT E

edited and translated by Christopher V. Salmon

Herrn Geheimrat Edmund Husserl,
with Affection and all Respect
from
Christopher V. Salmon
Feb. 1928

PHENOMENOLOGY

.....

EDMUND HUSSERL

Done into English

by

Christopher V. Salmon

<p. ii>

[Introduction]

"Phenomenology" denotes a new, descriptive, philosophical method, which, since the concluding years of the last century, has established (1) an *a priori* Psychological Discipline, able to provide the only secure basis on which a strong empirical psychology can be built, and (2) a universal philosophy, which can supply an organum for the methodical revision of all the sciences.[1]
<1>

PART I
PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY

[=D Part I]
[Pure Psychology: Its Field of Experience, Its Method, and Its Function]

§1. Natural Science and Psychology, Intentional[2] Experience

[=D, I §1]
[Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology]

Present-day Psychology, as the science of the "psychical" in its concrete connection with spatio-temporal reality, regards as its material whatever is present in the world as "ego-istic," i.e., "living", perceiving, thinking, willing, etc. actual, potential and habitual. And as the psychical is known as a certain stratum of existence, proper to men and beasts, psychology may be considered as a branch of anthropology and zoology. But animal nature is a part of physical reality, and that which is concerned with physical reality is natural science. Is it then possible to separate the psychical cleanly enough from the physical to establish a pure psychology parallel to natural science? That a purely psychological investigation is practicable within limits is shown by our obligation to it for our fundamental conceptions of the psychical, and most of those of the psycho-physical.

---

[1] See Spiegelberg, "On the Misfortunes of Edmund Husserl's...Article," p. 19, column b.
[2] In E1 this was originally typed as "International" and corrected to read as above.

[=D, I §2]
The Purely Psychical in Self-experience and Community Experience.
The Universal Description of Intentional Experiences]

But before determining the question of an unlimited psychology, we must be sure of the characteristics of psychological <2> experience and the psychical data it provides. We turn naturally to our immediate experiences. But we cannot discover the psychical in any experience, except by a "Reflection," or perversion of the ordinary attitude. We are accustomed to concentrate upon the matters, thoughts and values of the moment, and not upon the psychical "act of experience" in which these are apprehended. This "act" is revealed by a "Reflection"; and a Reflection can be practiced on every experience. Instead of the matters themselves, the values, goals, utilities, etc., we regard the subjective experiences in which these "appear". These "appearances" are phenomena, whose nature is to be a "consciousness-of" their object, real or unreal as it be. Common language catches this sense of "relativity", saying I was thinking *of* something, I was frightened *of* something, etc. Phenomenological Psychology takes its name from the "Phenomena," with the psychological aspect of which it is concerned: and the word "Intentional" has been borrowed from the scholastic to denote the essential "reference" character of the phenomena. All consciousness is "intentional."

In unreflective consciousness we are "directed" upon objects, we "intend" them; and Reflection reveals this to be an immanent process characteristic of all experience, though infinitely varied in form. To be conscious of something is no empty having of that something in consciousness. Each Phenomenon <3> has its own intentional structure, which analysis shows to be an ever-widening system of individually intentional and intentionally related components. The perception of a cube, for example, reveals a multiple and synthesized Intention: a continuous variety in the "appearance" of the cube according to differences in the points of view from which it is seen, and corresponding differences in "perspective", and all the difference between the "front side" actually seen at the moment, and the "backside" which is not seen, and which remains, therefore, relatively "indeterminate", and yet is supposed equally to be existent. Observation of this "stream" of "appearance-aspects" and of the manner of their synthesis, shows that every phase and interval is already in itself a "consciousness-of" something, yet in such a way, that with the constant entry of new phases, the total consciousness, at any moment, lacks not synthetic unity, and is, in fact, a consciousness of one and the same object. The intentional structure of the train of a Perception must conform to a certain type, if any physical object is to be perceived as There! And if the same object be intuited in other modes, if it be Imagined, or Remembered, or Copied, all its intentional forms recur, though modified in character from what

they were in the Perception, to correspond to their new modes. The same is true of every kind of psychical experience. Judgment, valuation, pursuit, these also are no empty having in consciousness of judgments, values, goals and means, but are likewise, experiences compounded **<4>** of an intentional stream, each conforming to its own fast type.

Phenomenological Psychology's comprehensive task is the systematic examination of the types and forms of intentional experience, and the reduction of their structures to the prime intentions, learning thus what is the nature of the psychical, and comprehending the being of the soul.

The validity of these investigations will obviously extend beyond the particularity of the psychologist's own soul. For psychical life may be revealed to us not only in self-consciousness but equally in our consciousness of other selves, and this latter source of experience offers us more than a reduplication of what we find in our self-consciousness, for it establishes the differences between "own" and "other" which we experience, and presents us with the characteristics of the "social-life". And hence the further task accrues to Psychology of revealing the Intentions of which the "social life" consists.

§2. The Closed Field of the Phenomenological-Psychological and Eidetic Reductions.

[=D, I §3]
[The Self-contained Field of the Purely Psychical. –
Phenomenological Reduction and True Inner Experience]

The Phenomenological Psychology must examine the self's experience of itself and its derivative experience of other selves and of society, but whether in so doing, it can be free of all psycho-physical admixture, is not yet clear. Can one reach a really pure self-experience and purely psychical data? **<5>** This difficulty, even since Brentano's discovery of Intentionality, as the fundamental character of the psychical, has blinded psychologists to the possibilities of Phenomenological Psychology. The psychologist finds his self-consciousness mixed everywhere with "external" experience and non-psychical realities. For what is experienced as external belongs not to the intentional "internal", though our experience of it belongs there as an experience of the external. The Phenomenologist, who will only notice Phenomena, and know purely his own "life", must practice an ἐποχή. He must inhibit every ordinary objective "position", and partake in no judgment concerning the objective world. The experience itself will remain what it was, an experience of this house, of this body, of this world in general, in its particular mode.

For one cannot describe any intentional experience, even though it be "illusory", a self-contradicting judgment and the like, without describing what in the experience is, as such, the object of consciousness.

Our comprehensive ἐποχή puts, as we say, the world between brackets, excludes the world which is simply There! from the subject's field, presenting in its stead the so-and-so-experienced, - perceived - remembered - judged - thought - valued - etc., world, as such, the "bracketted"[3] world. Not the world or any part of it appears, but the "sense" of the world. **<6>** To enjoy phenomenological experience we must retreat from the objects posited in the natural attitude to the multiple modes of their "appearance", to the "bracketted" objects.

The Phenomenological Reduction to Phenomena, to the purely Psychical, advances by two steps:

1. systematic and radical ἐποχή of every objectifying 'position' in an experience, practiced both upon the regard of particular objects and upon the entire attitude of mind, and

2. expert recognition, comprehension and description of the manifold "appearances" of what are no longer "objects" but "unities" of "sense". So that the Phenomenological Description will comprise two parts, description of the "Noetic" (νόεω)[4] or "experiencing", and description of the "Noematic" (νόημα) or the "experienced". Phenomenological experience, is the only experience which may properly be called "internal", and there is no limit to its practice. And as a similar "bracketing" of objective, and description of what then "appears" ("Noema" in "Noesis"), can be performed upon the "life" of another self which we represent to ourselves, the "reductive'' method can be extended from one's own self-experience to one's experience of other selves. And, further, that society, which we experience in a common consciousness, may be reduced not only to the intentional fields of the individual consciousness, but also by the means of an Inter-Subjective Reduction, to that **<7>** which unites these, namely the phenomenological unity of the social-life. Thus enlarged, the psychological concept of internal experience reaches its full extent.

But it takes more than the unity of a manifold "intentional life," with its inseparable complement of "sense-unities", to make a "Soul." For from the individual life that "ego-subject" cannot be disjoined, which persists as an identical ego, or "pole", to the particular intentions and the "habits" growing out of these. Thus the "inter-subjective," Phenomenologically reduced and concretely apprehended, seem [sic] to be a "society" of "persons", who share a conscious life.

---

[3] Salmon varies the spelling throughout the text: "bracketing" and "bracketting," but always "bracketted."

[4] Sic, for νοέω.

[=D, I §4]

[Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as an Eidetic Science]

Phenomenological Psychology can be purged of every empirical and psycho-physical element, but, being so purged, it cannot deal with "matters of fact." Any closed field may be considered as regards its "essence," its εἶδος,[5] and we may disregard the factual side of our Phenomena, and use them as "Examples" merely. We shall ignore individual souls and societies, to learn their a-priori, their "possible" forms. Our thesis will be "theoretical", observing the invariable through variation, disclosing a typical realm of a-priori. There will be no psychical existence whose "style" we shall not know. Psychological Phenomenology must rest upon Eidetic Phenomenology.

The Phenomenology of the Perception of Bodies, for example, will not be an account of actually occurring perceptions, **<8>** or those which may be expected to occur, but of that invariable "structure", apart from which no perception of a body, single or prolonged, can be conceived. The Phenomenological Reduction reveals the Phenomena of actual internal experience; the Eidetic Reduction, the essential Forms constraining psychical existence.

[=D, I §5]

[The Fundamental Function of Pure Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Psychology]

Men now demand that empirical Psychology shall conform to the exactness required by modern Natural Science. Natural Science, which was once a vague, inductive empiric, owes its modern character to the a-priori system of Forms, nature as it is "conceivable", which its separate disciplines, pure Geometry, Laws of Motion, Time etc., have contributed. The methods of Natural Science and Psychology are quite distinct, but the latter, like the former, can only reach "exactness" by a rationalization of the "Essential."

The psycho-physical has an a-priori which must be learned by any complete psychology; this a-priori is not Phenomenological, for it depends no less upon the essence of physical, or more particularly organic Nature.[6]

<9>

---

[5] Sic, for εἶδος. The error is reproduced in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* printing of the Article.

[6] Salmon's text omits two pages here. Those pages originally were pp. 11a and b in C, which Husserl took over into D, where he renumbered them as pp. 13 a and b. They correspond to *Hu* IX, pp. 286.1–287.1.

PART II
TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY

[=D Part II]
[Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Phenomenology]

§3. Locke and Descartes, and the Problems of Transcendental Philosophy

[=D, II §6]
[Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Locke's Psychologism]

Transcendental Philosophy may be said to have originated in Descartes, and Phenomenological Psychology in Locke, Berkeley and Hume, although the latter did not grow up primarily as a method or discipline to serve Psychology, but to contribute to the solution of the transcendental problematic which Descartes had posed. The theme propounded in the "Meditations" was still dominant in a philosophy which it had initiated. All reality, so it ran, and the whole of the world which we perceive as existent, may be said to exist only as the content of our own representations, judged in our judgments, or, at best, proved by our own knowing. There lay impulse enough to rouse all the legitimate and illegitimate Problems of transcendence, which we know. Descartes' "Doubting" first disclosed "transcendental subjectivity", and his "Ego Cogito" was its first conceptual handling. But the Cartesian transcendental "Mens" became the "Human Mind," which Locke undertook to explore; and Locke's exploration turned into a psychology of the internal experience. And since Locke thought his psychology could embrace the transcendental problems, **<10>** in whose interest he had begun his work, he became the founder of a false psychologistical philosophy, which has persisted because men have not analyzed their concept of "Subjective" into its two-fold significance. Once the transcendental be fairly stated, the ambiguity of the sense of the "Subjective" becomes apparent, and establishes the Phenomenological Psychology to deal with its one meaning, and the transcendental Phenomenology with its other.

[=A mixture of D:
II §10 Pure Psychology as Propaedeutic to Transcendental Phenomenology
and
II §8 Psychologism's Solution as a Transcendental Circle]

Phenomenological Psychology has been given the priority in this article, partly because it forms a convenient stepping stone to the Philosophy, and partly because it is nearer to the common attitude than is the transcendental.[7] Psychology, both in its eidetic and empirical disciplines, is a "positive" science, promoted in the "natural attitude" with the world before it for the ground of all its themes, while transcendental experience is difficult to realize because it is "supreme" and entirely "unworldly". Phenomenological Psychology, although comparatively new, and completely new as far as it uses Intentional Analysis, can be approached from the gates of any of the positive sciences: and being once reached, demands only a re-employment, in a more stringent mode, of its formal mechanism of Reduction and Analysis, to disclose the Transcendental Phenomena.

But it is not to be doubted that Transcendental Phenomenology could be developed independently of all psychology. **<11>**

[=D, II §7]
[The Transcendental Problem]

The[8] discovery of the double relativity of consciousness suggests the practice of both Reductions. The Psychological Reduction does not reach beyond the psychical in animal realities, for Psychology subserves real existence, and even its eidetic is confined to the possibilities of real worlds. But the Transcendental Problem will include the entire world and all its sciences, to "doubt" the whole. The world "originates" in us, as Descartes led men to recognize, and within us acquires its habitual influence. The general Significance of the world, and the definite sense of its particulars, is something of

[7] This sentence and the next three sentences are a broad paraphrase of various sentences and phrases in D III §10, along with some elements of §8. For example, in this first sentence, the reference to "priority" comes from p. 295.28 ("*Vorzug*"); "convenient stepping-stone" comes from p. 295.17 ("*die propädeutische Nützlichkeit*"); "nearer to the common attitude" echoes pp. 295.36–296.1 ("*Zugänglichkeit*"). The next sentence ("Psychology, both in its eidetic and empirical disciples...") echoes §8, *Hu* IX, p. 290.25–29. The third sentence (cf. "comparatively new...completely new") returns to §10, p. 295.34–36; and the last phrase of the paragraph ("...demands only a re-employment...of its formal mechanism") echoes §10 ("a mere reversal [*Wendung*] of its doctrinal content"). The latter phrases (re-employment / reversal, translating "*Wendung*") replace Draft B's "*Umdeutung*," which Heidegger had questioned in his remarks there at p. 28.8 (*Hu* IX, p. 277.8, n.). The last sentence of the section ("But it is not to be doubted...") picks up the theme of §10 p. 296.13–21.

[8] In Salmon's translation this sentence follows the previous one without a paragraph break.

which we are conscious within our perceiving, representing, thinking, valuing life, and therefore something "constituted" in some subjective genesis.

The world and its property, "in and for itself," exists as it exists, whether I, or We, happen, or not, to be conscious of it. But let once this general world, make its "appearance" in consciousness as "the" world, it is thenceforth related to the subjective, and all its existence and the manner of it, assumes a new dimension, becoming "incompletely intelligible," "questionable". Here then, is the Transcendental Problem: this "making its appearance", this "being for us" of the world, which can only gain its significance "subjectively", what is it? We may call the world "internal" because it is related to consciousness, but how can this quite "general" **<12>** world, whose "immanent" being is as shadowy as the consciousness wherein it "exists", contrive to appear before us in a variety of "particular" aspects, which experience assures us are the aspects of an independent, self-existent world? The problem also touches every "ideal" world, the world of pure number, for example, and the world of "truths in themselves". And no existence, or manner of existence, is less wholly intelligible than Ourselves. Each by himself, and in society, We, in whose consciousness the world is valid, being men, belong ourselves to the world.

[=D, II §9]
[The Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction and the Semblance of Transcendental Doubling]

Must[9] we, then, refer ourselves to ourselves to gain a worldly sense, a worldly being? Are we both psychologically to be called Men, Subjects of a psychical life, and yet be transcendental to ourselves and the whole world, being subjects of a transcendental world-constituting life? Psychical subjectivity, the "I" and "We" of everyday intent, may be experienced as it is in itself under the Phenomenological Psychological Reduction, and being eidetically treated, may establish a Phenomenological Psychology. But the transcendental-subjectivity, which for want of language we can only call again, "I myself", "We ourselves", cannot be found under the attitude of psychological or natural science, being no part at all of the objective world, but that subjective Conscious life itself, wherein the world and all its content is made for "us", for "me". We that are, indeed, men, spiritual and bodily, existing in the world, are therefore, "appearances" unto ourselves, **<13>** parcel of what "we" have constituted, pieces of the significance "we" have made. The "I" and "we", which we apprehend, presuppose a hidden "I" and "We" to whom they are "present".

---

[9] In Salmon's translation this sentence follows the previous one without a paragraph break.

To this Transcendental Subjectivity, transcendental experience gives us a direct approach. As the psychical experience was purified, so is the transcendental by the Reduction. The Transcendental Reduction may be regarded as a certain further purification of the psychological interest. The universal ἐποχή is carried to a further stage. Henceforth the "bracketting" includes not the world only, but its "souls" as well. The psychologist reduces the ordinarily valid world to a subjectivity of "souls", which are part of the world which they inhabit. The transcendental phenomenologist reduces the already psychologically purified to the transcendental, the most general, subjectivity, which makes the world and its "souls", and confirms them.

I no longer survey my Perception experiences, imagination-experiences, the psychological data which my psychological experience reveals: I learn to survey transcendental experience. **<14>** I am no longer interested in my own[10] existence. I am interested in the pure Intentional Life, wherein my psychically real experiences have occurred. This step raises the Transcendental Problem (the Transcendental being defined as the quality of that which is[11] consciousness) to its true level. We have to recognize that Relativity to Consciousness is not only an actual quality of our world, but, from eidetic necessity, the quality of every conceivable world. We may, in a free fancy, vary our actual world, and transmute it to any other which we can imagine, but we are obliged with the world to vary ourselves also, and ourselves we cannot vary except within the limits prescribed to us by the nature of Subjectivity. Change worlds as we may, each must ever be a world such as we could experience, prove upon the evidence of our theories, and inhabit with our practice. The Transcendental Problem is Eidetic. My psychological experiences, perceptions, imaginations and the like remain in form and content what they were, but I see them as "structures" now, for I am face to face at last with the ultimate structure of consciousness.

It is obvious that, like every other intelligible problem, the Transcendental Problem derives the means of its solution from an existence-stratum, which it presupposes and sets beyond the reach of its inquiry. This realm is no other than the bare Subjectivity of Consciousness in general, while the realm of its investigation remains not less than every **<15>** sphere which can be called "objective", which considered in its totality, and at its root, is the Conscious Life. No one, then, can justly propose to solve the Transcendental Problem by psychology either empirical or eidetic-phenomenological, without petitio principi, for psychology's 'Subjectivity' and 'Consciousness' are not that Subjectivity and Consciousness which our Philosophy will investigate. The

---

[10] Above the phrase "own existence" Husserl writes in longhand and in English (?) the words: "sensual [?] (real)."

[11] Above the word "consciousness" Husserl writes in German "*reines*" in the neuter nominative, as if to modify "*Bewußtsein.*"

Transcendental Reduction has supplanted the Psychological Reduction. In the place of the psychological "I" and "We", the transcendental "I" and "We" are comprehended in the concreteness of transcendental consciousness. But though the transcendental "I" is not my psychological "I," it must not be considered as if it were a second "I," for it is no more separated from my psychological "I" in the conventional sense of separation than it is joined to it in the conventional sense of being joined.

Transcendental self-experience may, at any moment, merely by a change of attitude, be turned back into psychological self-experience. Passing, thus, from the one to the other attitude, we notice a certain "identity" about the ego. What I saw under the Psychological Reflection as "my" objectification, I see under the Transcendental Reflection as self-objectifying, or, as we may also say, as objectified by the transcendental "I". We have only to recognize that what makes the psychological and transcendental spheres of experience parallel is **<16>** an "identity" in their significance, and that what differentiates them is merely a change of attitude, to realize that the psychological and transcendental Phenomenologies will also be parallel. Under the more stringent ἐποχή the psychological subjectivity is transformed into the transcendental subjectivity, and the psychological inter-subjectivity into the transcendental inter-subjectivity. It is this last which is the concrete, ultimate ground, whence all that transcends consciousness, including all that is real in the world, derives the sense of its existence. For all objective existence is essentially "relative", and owes its nature to a unity of Intention, which being established according to transcendental laws, produces consciousness with its habit of belief and its conviction.

§4. Phenomenology, the Universal Science

[=D Part III]
[Transcendental Phenomenology and Philosophy as Universal Science with Absolute Foundations]

[=D, III §11]
[Transcendental Phenomenology as Ontology]

Thus, as Phenomenology is developed, the Leibnizian foreshadowing of a Universal Ontology, the unification of all conceivable a-priori sciences, is improved, and realized upon the new and non-dogmatic basis of phenomenological method. For Phenomenology as the science of all concrete Phenomena proper to Subjectivity and Inter-subjectivity, is eo ipso an a-priori science of

all possible existence and existences. **<17>** Phenomenology is universal in its scope, because there is no a-priori which does not depend upon its intentional constitution, and derive from this its power of engendering habits in the consciousness that knows it, so that the establishment of any a-priori must reveal the subjective process by which it is established.

[=D, III §12]
[Phenomenology and the Crisis of Foundations in the Exact Sciences]

Once the a-priori disciplines, such as the mathematical sciences, are incorporated within Phenomenology, they cannot thereafter be beset by "paradoxes" or disputes concerning principles: and those sciences which have become a-priori independently of Phenomenology, can only hope to set their methods and premises beyond criticism by founding themselves upon it. For their very claim to be positive, dogmatic sciences, bears witness to their dependency, as branches merely, of that universal, eidetic ontology which is Phenomenology.

[=D, III §13]
[The Phenomenological Grounding of the Factual Sciences, and Empirical Phenomenology]

The endless task, this exposition of the Universum of the a-priori, by referring all objectives to their transcendental "origin", may be considered as one function in the construction of a universal science of Fact, where every department, including the positive, will be settled on its a-priori.

[=D, III §14]
[Complete Phenomenology as All-embracing Philosophy]

So[12] that our last division of the complete Phenomenology is thus: eidetic Phenomenology, or the Universal Ontology, for a First Philosophy; and Second Philosophy as the Science of the Transcendental Inter-subjectivity or Universum of Fact.

---

[12] This sentence (which follows the previous one without a paragraph break) roughly corresponds to Draft D, III §14, specifically to *Hu* IX, pp. 298.31–299.2, whereas the next sentence corresponds to the same section, p. 298.25–31. That is: Salmon has inverted the order of sentences in D, III, §14.

Thus the antique conception of Philosophy as the Universal **<18>** Science, Philosophy in the Platonic, Philosophy in the Cartesian, sense, that shall embrace all knowledge, is once more justly restored.

[=D, III §15]
[The "Ultimate and Highest" Problems as Phenomenological]

All[13] rational problems, and all those problems, which for one reason or another, have come to be known as "philosophical", have their place within Phenomenology, finding from the ultimate source of transcendental experience or eidetic intuition, their proper form and the means of their solution. Phenomenology itself learns its proper function of transcendental human "living" from an entire relationship to "self". It can intuit life's absolute norms and learn life's original teleological structure. Phenomenology is not less than man's whole occupation with himself in the service of the universal reason. Revealing life's norms, he does, in fact, set free a stream of raw consciousness intent upon the infinite idea of entire Humanity, Humanity in Fact and Truth.

Metaphysical, teleological, ethical problems, and problems of the history of philosophy, the problem of Judgment, all significant problems in general, and the transcendental bonds uniting them, lie within Phenomenology's capability.

[=D, III §16]
[The Phenomenological Resolution of All Philosophical Antitheses]

Phenomenology[14] proceeding from intuited data to the abstract heights, reconciles the traditional antagonistic points of view, without the art of a dialectic or the weakness of compromise: Rationalism (Platonism) and Empiricism, Relativism and Absolutism, Subjectivism and Objectivism, Idealism and Realism, Ontologism and Transcendentalism, Psychologism and **<19>** anti-Psychologism, Positivism and Metaphysic, teleological and Causal interpretations of the World! Everywhere just motives but only half-truths, and making absolute of partialities!

Subjectivism can only be subdued by a more consequential, by a transcendental, subjectivism, which may itself as well be called Objectivism, because it represents the rights of every objectivity which a harmonious experience can

---

[13] In Salmon's translation this sentence follows the previous one without a paragraph break.

[14] In Salmon's version, this sentence follows from the previous one without a paragraph break. N.B.: The version of the Article that got translated in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* omits E, pp. 18.19–20.19, that is the rest of the present paragraph beginning with this sentence, as well as the next four paragraphs. It takes up again with the paragraph "Phenomenological philosophy is but developing...."

produce, and validates the complete sense of each. Conventional Objectivism (Realistic) errs because it does not understand the Transcendental constitution. Relativism can only be subdued by a more consequential Relativism, that, namely, of transcendental Phenomenology, which makes the relativity of all objective existence intelligible, by expounding its transcendental constitution. And this includes the most radical of all conceptions of relativity, that, namely, of the transcendental subjectivity to itself, wherein the only possible significance of "absolute" existence is concealed, as existence "for itself."

Empiricism can only be subdued by a more consequential empiricism, which uses in the stead of the ordinary empiricist's narrow conception of experience, the widened one of "originating" intuition, as it is vindicated in all its forms, intuition of 'eidee,'[15] of apodictic evidence, etc. by phenomenological observation.

<20> As eidetic, Phenomenology is rationalistic, but subdues narrow dogmatic rationalism by a universal rationalism, which is the investigation of the essential, in transcendental subjectivity, of ego-consciousness and consciousness of objectivity.

And all other opposite but interrelated points of view are to be treated after the same fashion. The tracing back of all existence to the transcendental subjectivity and its constitutive, intentional operations, permits ultimately only a teleological consideration of the world, and yet, Phenomenology admits some truth to be resident in the Naturalism and Sensualism of Associationist Philosophy. For this philosophy could disclose Associations as Intentional Phenomena, as a type of passive, intentional synthesis, working according to the laws of transcendental, but purely passive, genesis. Hume's notion of "Fiction," and his laws of its "origin" of the persistent object of the world, is a good example, and also his discoveries concerning our perception of causality, although these led him to absurd conclusions.

Phenomenological[16] Philosophy is but developing the mainsprings of old Greek philosophy, and the supreme motive of Descartes. These have not died. They split into Rationalism and Empiricism. They stretch over Kant and German Idealism, and reach the present, confused day. They must be re-assumed, **<21>** subjected to methodical and concrete treatment. They can inspire a science without bounds.

Phenomenology demands of Phenomenalists that they shall forego particular closed systems of philosophy, and share decisive work with others towards livelong [sic] Philosophy.

---

[15] Husserl (*Hu* IX, p. 300.31–2; D, p. 30.13) has "*Anschauung vom Eidos.*" Apparently Salmon is trying to represent the Greek plural εἴδη.

[16] The version of the Article that was published in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* omits E, p. 18.19–20.19, that is, the previous four and a half paragraphs, beginning with "Phenomenology proceeding from intuited data...."

<p. 1>

REFERENCE[17]

E. Husserl: Logische Untersuchungen. 2 vols.
Halle a s 1900/01, 1928. 4 vols.

Principal Organ of the Phenomenological Movement,
Jahrbuch für Phänomenologie und phänomenologische
Forschung, hr. von. E. Husserl u.A. Halle a s 1913 et. seq:

Including (also to be had separately) Ideen zu
einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen
Philosophie. Halle a s 1922. E. Husserl.

Ontology, M. Heidegger, H. Conrad-Martius.

Logic and Psychology, A. Pfänder.

Ethics, Max Scheler, D. von Hildebrand.

Philosophy of the State, A. Reinach.
and the Philosophy of Law, E. Stein.

Aesthetics, M. Geiger.

Mathematical Philosophy and the Philosophy
of Natural Science, O. Becker.
Study of Leibnitz, D. Mahnke.

Hume's Philosophy, (in English), Christopher V. Salmon.

Outside the Jahrbuch:
M. Scheler. Vom Umsturz der Werte. Bonn. 1919.

Vom Ewigen im Menschen, Leipzig. 1921.

Die Wissensformen und die Gesellschaft. Leipzig. 1926.

[17] We reproduce below Salmon's own underlinings (or lack thereof) and spelling.

<p. 2>

Jean Héring.	Phenomenologie[18] et philosophie religieuse. Strassburg. 1925.
K. Stavenhagen.	Absolute Stellungnahmen[.] Erlangen. 1925. (The Phenomenology of Religion).
R. Odebrecht.	Grundlegung einer ästhetisch [sic] Wertheorie [sic] Berlin. 1927.
H. Lipps.	Phänomenologie der Erkenntnis. I. Bonn. 1927.
Felix Kaufmann.	Logik und Rechtswissenschaft, Tübingen. 1922.
	Die Kriterium [sic] des Rechts. Tübingen. 1922.
F. Schreier.	Grundbegriffe und Grundformen des Rechts. Wien. 1924.
Gerh. Husserl.	Rechtskraft und Rechtsgeltung I. Berlin. 1925.
	Smaller phenomenological studies in the Philosophische Anzeiger, Bonn. 1925. et. seq.

[18] Salmon spells the word as above, without the accents: Phénoménologie.

PART TWO

THE AMSTERDAM LECTURES (1928)

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE AMSTERDAM LECTURES

Richard E. Palmer

There are several reasons that the Amsterdam Lectures, although Husserl did not publish them during his lifetime,[1] still hold interest for present-day readers:

First, they offer a relatively short but still slightly more nuanced introduction to Husserl's phenomenology than the *Britannica* article, and they were written when he was at the height of his powers. Indeed, the Amsterdam Lectures were the first major public lectures given by Husserl after his formal retirement in Freiburg in early April, 1928.

Second, the Amsterdam Lectures are also the closing chapter to Husserl's effort at collaboration with Heidegger in defining phenomenology for the *EB*, as this volume makes clear. Joseph Kockelmans in his *Edmund Husserl's Phenomenological Psychology* (1967), rightly referred to the Amsterdam Lectures as a "fifth draft" of the *Britannica* article.[2] What Husserl hoped would be a product of their joint endeavor ended up with Husserl dropping even the few paragraphs of Heidegger's attempt at a draft. This was an ominous signal to Husserl – perhaps too late – that his vision of phenomenology as a universal, rigorous science established on absolute foundations was not going to be continued by his trusted former assistant and eventual successor. In this context, the Lectures, written and delivered in April 1928, some months after the breakdown in their collaboration, offer Husserl a further opportunity to explain and defend his standpoint in the *EB* article. In other words, the Amsterdam Lectures may be of interest as an indirect response to Heidegger.

Third, quite apart from their link to the abortive collaboration with Heidegger, the Amsterdam Lectures are also of value as a commentary on and elaboration of the text of the *EB* article. One can fruitfully compare the two documents simply in terms of their elaboration of the topics of phenomenological

---

[1] "Die Amsterdamer Vorträge," along with the *Britannica* article, were published only in 1962 as an appendix in Husserliana volume IX: *Phänomenologische Psychologie: Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1925*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. The four drafts of the *Britannica* article are found on pp. 237–301, plus text-critical commentary, 590–615. "Die Amsterdamer Vorträge" are found on pp. 302–349, plus text-critical commentary, 615–624.

[2] Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press, p. 234.

psychology and transcendental phenomenology. As he indicated in his letter to Hendrik Pos of March 9, 1928, Husserl intended to devote one two-hour lecture to each topic,[3] i.e., equal weight, yet the first topic seems to have predominated as he worked out the Lectures.

Fourth, the Lectures also set forth the relationship Husserl envisioned between phenomenology and a projected new psychology based on phenomenology. This emphasis in the Lectures is reflected in the title: "Amsterdam Lectures <on> Phenomenological Psychology." Husserl may have changed the title to appeal to a wider audience. In any case, the envelope containing the manuscript in the Husserl Archives carries the title in Husserl's own hand: "Phenomenological Psychology: Dutch Lectures."[4] Of course, the discussion of phenomenological psychology was already a major topic in the *Britannica* article. This fact shows how closely Husserl identified the success of his transcendental phenomenology with the project of a new psychology. Indeed, Walter Biemel in his introduction to *Phänomenologische Psychologie: Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1925* – the same volume in which the drafts of the *EB* article and Amsterdam Lectures were published as supplements – notes that throughout his career Husserl regarded psychology as a test case and a model in which he could show that his phenomenology could transform a specific scientific discipline.[5]

Finally, both the *Britannica* article and the Amsterdam Lectures were addressed specifically to an international audience, originally to the English-speaking readers of the *Britannica* article, and in the enlarged form of the Amsterdam Lectures, to the Dutch, French, American, Russian, and other scholarly members of his audience in The Netherlands at the time.

The Amsterdam Lectures, then, offer us first, a text which is interesting in its own right as an introduction to phenomenology, and second a text of interest in relation to the break with Heidegger. Third, they are of interest as an elaboration of the ideas in the better-known precursor text, the *Britannica* article. Fourth, this is a text that he carefully polished to present his project of a new psychology based on transcendental phenomenology, and, finally, the Lectures are of value to us because they are consciously addressed to an international audience interested in phenomenology, in which those of us who read him in English translation are included. These five dimensions of the significance of the Amsterdam Lectures for us today will provide a thematic framework for the following discussion of the Amsterdam Lectures.

---

[3] Edmund Husserl, *Briefwechsel*. Edited by Karl Schuhmann in cooperation with Elisabeth Schuhmann. 10 volumes. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993–1994. See vol. 4: *Die Freiburger Schule*, letter to Pos of March 9, 1925.

[4] *Hu* IX: 615, 617.

[5] *Hu* IX: xiv.

I

We know from a pencilled note in Husserl's own hand on the envelope containing the manuscript of the Lectures when they were composed and that they are based on the *Britannica* article. He writes: "This reworking of the typewritten draft of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* article was finished in Göttingen between the 7th and the 17th of August, 1928."[6] The Amsterdam Lectures were written out during an intense ten-day stay at the home of a friend in Göttingen. These dates are further verified in Husserl's correspondence, which has recently appeared in ten volumes.[7] Between the sojourn in Göttingen and their arrival in Amsterdam on the morning of April 23, Edmund and Malvine took time to attend the celebration of Carl Stumpf's 80th birthday in Berlin and also to visit there with their daughter Elli and husband Jakob Rosenberg. In a letter from Malvine Husserl to Ingarden dated May 6, 1928, the day before they take the overnight train back to Freiburg, Malvine gives a glowing report of Husserl's reception in Holland. She writes: "My husband gave two lectures [during the week] and a discussion evening [on Saturday the 28th]. It was obvious that the audience, consisting mainly of professors, practicing theologians, psychiatrists, and so on, were deeply touched. In spite of the difficulty of the material (introduction to phenomenology) and the length of the lectures (each two hours with a short break) they were in intense, rapt attention [*brennender Aufmerksamkeit*] right to the end."[8] In the audience for the first lecture was Leo Shestov, the Russian existentialist thinker who had apparently sharply criticized Husserl in his writings. Husserl heard he was also lecturing and invited him to hear his lecture and also to have lunch with him on the following day. Shestov in a memoir vividly describes his discussion with Husserl, who accused him of presenting a rigid image <*steineres Standbild*> of him, and then smashing it. The picture of Husserl he presents in the memorial is quite different. He noted that Husserl stood up at the podium throughout the presentation, which lasted over two hours, and delivered it "with an extraordinary lightness, and with the art and power of a man forty rather than seventy years old."[9] The whole venture into Holland, as we know from the correspondence, was heartening and exhilirating for Husserl.

Husserl's high regard for the *EB* article is seen in the fact that when he wanted a concise introduction to his phenomenological psychology, he did not

---

[6] See *Hu* IX: 615, 617.

[7] In this connection, see especially vol. 4.

[8] See Edmund Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, ed. Roman Ingarden. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1968.

[9] Karl Schuhmann, *Husserl-Chronik: Denk- und Lebensweg Edmund Husserls* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1977), p. 330, citing pp. 51–52 of Leo Shestov's "Edmund Husserl: Dem Andenken des grossen Philosophen," in *Zur Philosophie der Zeit* (1. Beiheft of *Deutsche Beiträge*, Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1948), pp. 49–78.

go back to his detailed semester-long lecture-courses on phenomenological psychology – like the 1925 Summer Semester lecture-course which constitutes the first part of *Hu* IX – but instead turned to his German typescript of the *Britannica* article. After all, as we know from his letter to Ingarden dated 26 December 1927, "the new encyclopedia article has also cost a lost of work. It will come out in expanded form in the next volume of the *Jahrbuch*. I would like to shape the article in such a way that it furnishes a somewhat usable guiding string <*Leitfaden*> for the chain of further publications, above all the pieces in *Ideas 2*."[10] Clearly, Husserl intended the *Britannica* article to be not just a statement for an internationally known reference work but also to function as a programmatic outline for his future endeavors. It was in essence to be an outline of his phenomenology and therefore could provide the inclusive introduction he wanted for these lectures.

Yet Husserl never prepared the Amsterdam Lectures for publication. We know he used the first lecture he gave at Amsterdam, on phenomenological psychology, again at Groningen on the 30th of April, and, as we may infer from the many cross-outs and pencilled in rewordings in the manuscript, probably also in connection with the lecture-course, "Introduction to Phenomenological Psychology," and the seminar, "Phenomenological-Psychological Exercises," when he arrived in Freiburg on May 8 to begin the summer semester.[11] (At the request of the university, he taught the summer semester beyond his retirement to enthusiastic students.) He had other projects in 1928–1929, such as the *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, the *Cartesian Meditations*, which were published only in French (1931) during his lifetime,[12] and in the 1930s he poured his energies into the *Crisis*.[13] Another reason would seem to be that the projected third part of the Amsterdam Lectures, which would parallel sections 11–16 of the *Britannica* article was never finished. Seemingly the pressure of other matters pushed this one aside, such that even the planned German publication of *Britannica* article in the *Jahrbuch* never took place.

---

[10] Edmund Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, edited by Roman Ingarden. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1968. Letter of December 12, 1927.

[11] These extensive cross-outs and rewordings in the manuscript are given in detail in the text-critical commentary in the German edition and may be referred to in *Hu* IX 615–624. Although they were translated and a copy of the translation is preserved in the Husserl-Archives at Leuven, they did not seem needed for the present English version of the text.

[12] See the recent two-volume critical edition of this important text: Eugen Fink, VI. *Cartesianische Meditation.* Teil 1. *Die Idee einer transzendentalen Methodenlehre*, ed. Hans Ebeling, Jann Holl, and Guy van Kerckhove. Teil 2: *Ergänzungsband*, ed. Guy van Kerckhoven. *Texte aus dem Nachlass Eugen Finks (1932), mit Anmerkungen und Beilgen aus dem Nachlass Edmund Husserls. Husserliana Dokumente* series volume II/1 and volume II/2. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer, 1987.

[13] See *CM, ibid., Formale und Transzendentale Logik: Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft*, ed. Paul Janssen (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974), Husserliana vol. XVII, and in the 1930's, *Die Krisis du europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendentale Phänomenologie: Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie*, ed. Walter Biemel (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1954), Husserliana vol. VI. All are available in English translations.

So the Amsterdam Lectures could be seen as an unfinished torso, another of Husserl's many introductions that never quite got finished.[14] Yet even in their unfinished state, they comprise a highly polished articulation of Husserl's vision of phenomenology that was written at the height of his career. They merit our attention, then, first of all, in their own right.

II

The Amsterdam Lectures do not stand alone, however. They are the *fifth draft* of another text that has exerted great effort toward offering a what Herbert Spiegelberg has called "the concisest introduction to phenomenology ever prepared by Husserl": the *Britannica* article.[15] This is a text fraught with the history of a fatefully failed collaboration with Heidegger in defining phenomenology, a history which by offering all five drafts, this volume hopes in part to illuminate. Husserl had remarked in earlier days, "Phenomenology, that's Heidegger and me." Not so, it would seem. At least not as Husserl had imagined. Yet even after this failed effort at collaboration, Husserl did not oppose Heidegger's nomination to his chair, and did not publicly protest his treatment by Heidegger. A highly confidential letter to Alexander Pfänder dated 6 January 1931, published only years later in the *Pfänder-Studien* and now in the 10–volume set of Husserl's *Briefwechsel*,[16] sheds glaring light on Husserl's feelings at the time. Pfänder's correspondence with Husserl dates back to 1904 and he had been Husserl's assistant for many years. He had co-edited and published in the *Jahrbuch* from its first issue. He wrote in a letter dated January 2, 1931, of his wife's painful illness and his own shattered hopes for Husserl's chair: "For ten years you told everyone who would listen that you would name me as your successor.... Your behavior appears to me to be a great disloyalty that leaves me deeply wounded."[17] It is a heart-rending letter, and it provoked Husserl to an unparalleled outburst of grieving in which he gives vent to his sense of betrayal and outrage at his treatment by Heidegger. He tells Pfänder that he himself is more betrayed even than Pfänder. His life-work, his hopes and dreams, were at stake; his trust in a man who had given himself out to be his friend and supporter had been betrayed. Because this stunning confidential letter sheds such a revealing personal light on

---

[14] Evidence that Husserl had definite plans to publish the Amsterdam Lectures can be seen in Malvine's letter to Ingarden of December 2, 1929, where she speaks of Landgrebe interrupting Husserl's work on the Amsterdam Lectures. Cf. *Briefe an Roman Ingarden,* December 2, 1929.

[15] "On the Misfortunes of Edmund Husserl's *Encyclopedia Britannica* artice, 'Phenomenology'," *JBSP*, 2,2 (1971), p. 76.

[16] *Pfänder-Studien*, Phaenomenologica 84, pp. 345–49 and in *Briefwechsel*, vol. 2., letter of January 6, 1931.

[17] *Briefwechsel*, vol. 2, letter of Pfänder to Husserl, January 2, 1931.

Husserl's feelings and experience, including Heidegger's refusal of even the basic human courtesies, such as greeting him when they pass on the street, and because, indeed, it contains a virtual history of their relationship *as Husserl saw it*, including an account of why he supported Heidegger's candidacy for his chair in spite of their differences, it is included as an appendix to the present volume.[18] We glimpse in this letter what must have been Husserl's state of mind as he read Heidegger's *Being and Time,* and probably *KPM*, in Como during the August 15–September 10 break of 1929, for instance, scanning the pages of those writings for what he had not seen before. Already in December of 1928 he was well aware that Heidegger had little use for his approach to phenomenology. He complained to Ingarden of Heidegger's "thinking my methodical way to be outdated and my results to belong to a fallen worldliness,"[19] but he still went along with the nomination of Freiburg's increasingly famous native son.

Since Professor Sheehan has already in his introduction dealt in detail with the interaction between Husserl and Heidegger in relation to the first four drafts of the *Britannica* article, we will only here remark on what is involved in seeing the Amsterdam Lectures as the final chapter of the *Britannica* article story. When one does this, one tends to read the text not simply in terms of the intrinsic merits of Husserl's arguments but in relation to the issues that divide Husserl and Heidegger. In other words, the Amsterdam Lectures can be seen as an indirect reply to Heidegger. Certainly it is possible to read them as a continuation of that debate, in which Husserl reaffirms, defends, and explains his position on key issues that divide them. We see in the Amsterdam Lectures, even more than the *Britannica* article, Husserl going to great lengths to explain the transcendental reduction and its roots in the transcendental ego. We also see him continuing to make his goal a scientific philosophy with an absolute grounding, and we see him continue his project of developing a psychology of pure eidetic structures. Of course, Husserl's view of phenomenology as "rigorous science" and as a foundational discipline on which all future scientific investigations would depend, strongly distinguishes Husserl from Heidegger. As in his later *Cartesian Meditations*, Husserl here allies himself with Descartes. For instance, the closing lines of the *Britannica* article with their reference to phenomenology as a joint effort in which each researcher would contribute to knowledge in the customary way of scientific progress show Husserl cherishing the essentially Cartesian vision of a foundation of apodictic knowledge on which the edifice of science could be built. For Husserl, as for Descartes, the foundation for such a universal science on absolute foundations lay in the apodictic insight by the ego as it turns back on

[18] See pp. 479–493 in the present volume.
[19] Edmund Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, December 26, 1929.

its own constituting acts using the method of eidetic, phenomenological, and then transcendental reduction to arrive at the level of the transcendental ego.

For Heidegger, however, the ontological foundations of Dasein did not lie in the transcendental ego but in the opaque realm of Dasein's comprehension of the lifeworld in terms of its factual-historical-temporal existence. With such a foundation there can be no question of a "scientific philosophy" or "absolute grounding" of knowledge. In this regard, as Walter Biemel points out in his introduction to *Hu* IX, Husserl consciously allies himself with Dilthey's project of developing objectively verifiable insights as a foundation for psychology and the human sciences.[20] Indeed, he attempts to fulfill Dilthey's dream. But the project of providing a theoretical, more respectably scientific foundation for psychology did not interest Heidegger, although the structures of Dasein's self-awareness with the call of conscience, sense of authenticity, and being-towards-death might have some relevance to psychology. These, of course, were never intended as a theoretical foundation for a more scientific psychology. Husserl seems not to have allowed himself to face the implications of Heidegger's contempt for his scientific pretensions, so much was he taken up with his definition of the role of phenomenology and his own plans for branching out and applying it scientifically among the increasing number of students interested in his phenomenology.

III

The Amsterdam Lectures are also of hermeneutical interest as a commentary and elaboration of the ideas in the *Britannica* article. The two texts are parallel documents, the one a "reworking" [*Überarbeitung*] of the other, yet the reworking that occupied Husserl for ten days in Göttingen is so thorough that it is very difficult to locate parallel sentences in the two texts even when they are mounted side by side. When one does this, however, it soon becomes apparent how highly condensed a statement of Husserl's thinking the *Britannica* article is. The availability of a text that is, on the average between two and three times longer under each parallel section heading in the Amsterdam Lectures gives us what is in essence a commentary on the earlier text. Quite possibly Husserl himself had doubts that his intentions could be persuasively and intelligibly presented in the length to which he restricted himself in the *Britannica* article.

One can picture Husserl's frustration when confronted with the task of compressing the work of a lifetime into a 4,000-word article addressed to an audience totally unacquainted with his previous work. This was a task of

[20] "Einleitung des Herausgebers," *Hu* IX: xvi.

considerable weight, and one can also understand that he would seek Heidegger's help in it. There is also here a hermeneutical question of how much "preunderstanding" is required to make sense of Husserl's argument in the *Britannica* article. Are we perhaps talking about a "Mission Impossible" undertaken with all good will by Husserl but intrinsically beyond the possibility of accomplishment? Certainly the drastic cutting by translator Christopher Salmon further hampers Husserl's effort to clarify the meaning of phenomenology. Husserl not only undertakes to explain his overall project in that space but also to clarify what it means to overcome psychologism, how the reductions work, and why the transcendental problem remained unsolved for three centuries. Husserl is not here referring to matters already familiar to his readers; rather, he is confronting some of the thorniest problems in the history of modern thought and attempting to present his solution to them. Phenomenology, he argues, holds the solution to problems still unsolved in the sciences, which cannot overcome the chains of positivity because they lack the method of an epoché that would place the world in parenthesis; they lack the technique of eidetic variation as a way of finding the essential structures of consciousness, and because they are lost in the positivity of the natural focus, they cannot see the constitutive activities by which things in the world are given in consciousness.

Can such a project as Husserl is proposing possibly be made persuasive in so short a space as the *Britannica* article? Heidegger had suggested to Husserl that exemplary studies would be needed to demonstrate his point. It would seem that in preparing the Amsterdam Lectures Husserl was acutely aware of this problem, and in reworking the *Britannica* article for presentation in Amsterdam, he took pains to expand and explain what had sometimes been stated in a single sentence in the earlier text. It is clear that in the Amsterdam Lectures Husserl takes advantage of having more space to unfold what might have seemed enigmatic to readers of the *Britannica* article – either in the full German version or the abridged version, cut by nearly in half, that emerged from the translator. Husserl seems to have left the painful task of further cutting entirely to the translator, Christopher Salmon, not even reviewing his work.[21] Indeed, according to Herbert Spiegelberg, there is a possibility that Husserl never even read the English version, since there are no reading marks at all to be found on his copy. Yet despite the fact that Christopher Salmon had studied in Freiburg and was a friend of Boyce Gibson's who helped with the translation of *Ideas I*, he even translated phenomenology as phenomenalism.[22]

So we have in the *Britannica* article and the Amsterdam Lectures two

[21] See Spiegelberg's "Misfortunes" article, pp. 75–76.

[22] See his "Misfortunes" article, cited above, and also his article accompanying translated excerpts of Boyce Gibson's 1928 diary in Freiburg, "From Husserl to Heidegger: Excerpts from a 1928 Freiburg Diary by W. R. Boyce Gibson," *JBSP* 2, 1(1971): 58–83.

parallel but very different texts with special possibilities of mutual illumination. Both follow the same sequence of topics, although in the Amsterdam Lectures Husserl does find himself early drawn into explanation of method in relation to a pure psychology. The topics are parallel not just in possessing the same three divisional headings but in the whole sequence of subheadings. The insertion by the German editor of additional subheadings not in the manuscript of the Lectures may somewhat obscure the parallelism. This might give the impression that Husserl is choosing new headings when in fact he is merely wandering off the topic under headings he has taken over from the *Britannica* article as guides for his exposition. Fortunately these editorial additions are clearly indicated in the text, so there are not grounds for confusion.

A systematic comparison of the two texts is beyond the scope of this introduction, but we can at least compare the length with which different topics are treated under the different headings. When we compare the main and subordinate headings in the two texts, we find that both of them project the same three main parts: I. Pure Psychology: Its Field of Experience, Its Method, and Its Function; II. Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Phenomenology; and III. Transcendental Phenomenology and Philosophy as Universal Science with Absolute Foundations. Yet the two Amsterdam Lectures take up only the first two parts, so we have Part III only as represented in the *Britannica* article. Since, in the German edition in *Hu* IX, both texts are printed in the same type and line length, we may also compare the extent of coverage of each topic by counting the relative number of lines in each parallel section of the two texts. Of course, the headings added to the Amsterdam Lectures by the German editor, Walter Biemel, do not have a parallel in the *Britannica* article, but Biemel and we have indicated this by marking the headings with appropriate editorial insertion brackets.

NUMBER OF LINES IN EACH SECTION OF THE *BRITANNICA* ARTICLE COMPARED WITH THE AMSTERDAM LECTURES

	EB article	Amsterdam Lectures
<1. The Two Senses of Phenomenology: As Psychological Phenomenology and as Transcendental Phenomenology.>	no heading; 17 lines	43 lines
2. Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology.	29 lines	93 lines
<3. The Method of Pure Psychology (Intuition and Reflection); Intentionality as the Fundamental Characteristic of the Mental.>	no heading	90 lines
<4. The Meaning of the Concept of Purity.>	missing	108 lines
5. The Purely Mental in Experience of the Self and of Community. The Universal Description of Intentional Processes.	98 lines	50 lines
6. Phenomenological <Psychological> Reduction and Genuine Experience of Something Internal.	98 lines	106 lines
<7. The Ego-Pole as Center of Acts of the Ego. The Synthetic Character of Consciousness.>	missing	252 lines
8. Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as Eidetic Science.	34 lines	112 lines
9. The Essential Function of Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Psychology.	72 lines	142 lines
10. Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Locke's Psychologism.	46 lines	113 lines
11. The Transcendental Problem.	73 lines	134 lines
12. The Psychologistic Solution to the Transcendental Problem.	75 lines	70 lines
13. The Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction and the Transcendental Semblance of Doubling.	111 lines	239 lines
<14. On the Parallelism between Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Phenomenology.>	missing	58 lines
15. Pure Psychology as Propaedeutic for Transcendental Phenomenology. <The Radical Overcoming of Psychologism.>	51 lines	85 lines
16. Constructing Transcendental Philosophy	missing	98 lines
Total lines in *EB* article without Part III, compared to AL	700 lines	1793 lines
Total lines in *EB* article including Part III, compared to AL	880 lines	1793 lines

The *Britannica* article, of course, contains the six sections in Part III, numbered 11–16 in the *Britannica* article and containing 180 lines of text, but even with this additional length, the *Britannica* article remains less than half as long as the later text; a few sections are shorter, but others are three times as long, and on the average they are twice as long. Among the new sections added, of course, the longest is "The Ego-Pole as Center of the Acts of the Ego: The Synthetic Character of Consciousness," numbering 252 lines of text. Clearly, it is fair to see the Amsterdam Lectures both as a reply to Heidegger and as a further elaboration and commentary on ideas presented more concisely in the *Britannica* article.

IV

Whatever the merits of the Amsterdam Lectures, first, as a general introduction to phenomenology, or second, in terms of their connection with the Husserl-Heidegger differences as they emerge in the five drafts of the *Britannica* article, and third, whatever the value of the Lectures as a commentary on the *Britannica* article, they also hold interest for us as one of Husserl's most focussed statements on the relationship of phenomenological psychology to transcendental phenomenology. It is true that we do not have the projected third part on transcendental phenomenology as such, but this only intensifies the focus on phenomenological psychology. Nearly half the section titles contain the term psychology in one form or another. It is true that the "Summer Semester Lectures of 1925" in *Hu* IX give a longer and more detailed discussion of phenomenological psychology, and that this lecture-course was repeated in the years up to and after his retirement, but one can argue that these lectures further prepared his thinking for the distilled formulations in the Amsterdam Lectures.

In Husserl the subject of psychology and phenomenology has several dimensions which emerge in these lectures: the problem of psychologism, against which Husserl struggled his whole life; the problem of how to relate phenomenological philosophy to the empirical discipline of psychology in some way other than merely a critique of naive positivity; and finally how to make the move from "psychological phenomenology" (or "phenomenological psychology") to a transcendental phenomenology free of every vestige of psychologism and positivity. Like Wilhelm Dilthey in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Husserl wanted to formulate a new psychology that would be objectively valid and verifiable like other sciences; it would involve a collaborative establishment of "results" that could be validated because they were based on solid foundations and would gradually be built up into a reli-

able body of knowledge. In the Amsterdam Lectures Husserl makes it clearer than ever before that phenomenological psychology has a two-fold purpose: First, by creating a pure psychology that can parallel (insofar as this is possible) the apriori natural sciences of mechanics and pure geometry, it can have a reformative effect on empirical psychology. The eidetic insights into the essential structures of mental life give us a body of apriori knowledge that is not in any way a matter of empirical fact but of universal principles. But a "pure psychology" can have another and totally different function, and this is Husserl's deeper purpose: it can be the propaedeutic for transcendental phenomenology.

These two functions correspond roughly to the first two parts of the *Britannica* article and form the two main sections of the Amsterdam Lectures as we now have them. Husserl makes very clear the intermediate position of phenomenological psychology: It in no way has the character of empirical psychology, which remains the victim of positivity and lacks the eidetic component as well as the foundation of certainty that is afforded by apodictic insight into essential structures. On the other hand, it is not transcendental phenomenology. Empirical psychology will never have the character of the pure eidetic psychology Husserl is recommending, nor will this pure psychology ever have the character of transcendental phenomenology, for it has not made the transcendental turn. More than ever before, Husserl has clarified to himself the reformative potential of a pure psychology and the possibilities of such a pure psychology as a preliminary step toward a transcendental phenomenology. He has also clarified a program by which this transcendental phenomenology can be approached within a psychological framework – that of a "pure psychology." At the same time, he makes it quite clear that the historical roots of transcendental phenomenology do not lie in psychology at all, and thus it would be quite possible to develop a transcendental phenomenology through pure philosophical reflection without any recourse to the empirical dimensions of psychology.

Perhaps because of the compelling clarity he had reached regarding the relation of phenomenology to psychology, perhaps in order to bid for the attention of psychologists in his potential audience, Husserl dwells on on the topic of method in a pure psychology. It is more clear than ever that Husserl expects the reformative potential of phenomenology to be felt first in psychology. This is the central theme of the first part of the *Britannica* article and the whole first Amsterdam Lecture. Yet just this project only further separates Husserl from Heidegger, for it was never Heidegger's concern to provide apodictic foundations for the empirical sciences, nor does he address psychologists as a major target audience for *Being and Time*, although some psychologists later found it of interest. At just this point Heidegger was seeking, in the semester lectures on Kant that became his *Kant and the Problem of*

Metaphysics, to settle the score with Kant – and by extension transcendental philosophy as such, including Husserl's. As he later remarks in his 1962 letter to Richardson that serves as a preface to Richardson's book on Heidegger, he eventually deserted the whole project of a fundamental ontology because it stood too much in the shadow of transcendental philosophy.[23] But for Husserl, if philosophy is to be a "rigorous science"[24] and if it is to serve as a reformative apriori discipline, then it must affirm in the strongest terms its character as a transcendental discipline. It is this point that Husserl passionately insists on: Philosophy must be transcendental if it is to be philosophy and if it is to address the crisis in the European sciences – which, for Husserl, it self-evidently must do. Thus, it is not just the turn to psychology that separates Husserl from Heidegger, and it certainly does; it is the transcendental turn itself, especially as based on a pure psychology. Whatever the ways in which the turn to the *via psychologica* as propaedeutic to phenomenology may have separated Husserl from Heidegger, it is clear that Husserl in the Amsterdam Lectures is reaffirming that avenue of access and addressing directly the issue of how his phenomenology can relate to an empirical science of psychology. These lectures remain an important articulation, now in English, of that relationship as he saw it after three decades of work with the topic and after his break with Heidegger.[25]

V

Finally, the Amsterdam Lectures are of special interest to readers of Husserl in English because in their original form – as the *Britannica* article – they were intended for an English-speaking audience. How much this may have influenced Husserl is hard to say, but certainly he was aware of addressing a readership unfamiliar even with the term phenomenology. We know Husserl saw the *Britannica* article as an important project to which he devoted intense effort, and yet the article was mutilated in translation, being abridged from 7,000 to 4,000 words, and remained unpublished in German. Thus, the publication of its original German text in 1962, along with the Amsterdam Lec-

---

[23] M. Heidegger, "Preface/Vorwort" in William J. Richardson, S.J., *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1963), pp. xiv-xv.

[24] As Husserl had argued in "Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft," *Logos* 1(1911), pp. 289–341, and in the critical text edition, pp. 3–62, in Husserliana, vol. XXV: *Aufsätze und Vorträge: 1911–1921*, ed. Thomas Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer, 1987.

[25] Already in 1967, Joseph Kockelmans' book, *Edmund Husserl's Phenomenological Psychology* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press) made Husserl's views on psychology available in English, an important contribution, and indeed that book contains an extensive paraphrase of the Amsterdam Lectures. Recently, he has also published a text, translation, and commentary on the *Britannica* article in a book titled *Edmund Husserl's Phenomenology* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1994).

tures, now translated especially for this volume, was an important event in the publication of Husserl's writings.

It should be remembered that the Amsterdam Lectures, like the *Britannica* article, *also* reached out to an international audience – albeit one that could understand Husserl in German. But Husserl is cognizant that German may not be the native language of many of his audience, in any case. He also knows the audience will consist of learned people from a range of disciplines, not just philosophy. So the Amsterdam Lectures, then, are directed not just to philosophers but also and especially to psychologists and by extension to all those inquiring researchers and practicianers who would find in phenomenology a transcendental foundation for their methodologies. Furthermore, it is not without significance for us as readers that, in contrast with the *Britannica* article, the Amsterdam Lectures were composed specifically for oral presentation. The compression appropriate for an encyclopedia article would obviously not be necessary or appropriate for a scholarly lecture in Amsterdam. Here Husserl is trying to put the same ideas into a form that can be understood by persons confronted with these ideas in oral form. His argument becomes more intelligible and accessible. Husserl the pedagogue, a man with a lifetime of experience in lecturing, surely must have been on that occasion the lively and engaging lecturer Shestov depicts in his memoir.

At the height of his career in 1928, when his classrooms were jammed to standing room only, not just with German students but also Japanese, Polish, Austrian, Australian, Hungarian, British, and other nationalities, Husserl's philosophy seemed to be taking hold internationally. He was invited to speak in London, Paris, Amsterdam and Groningen. Reassured, energetic, light on his feet, he held his audience in Amsterdam for two hours on two lecture occasions, had interviews with interested persons, offered a conversation-evening for further discussion, and confidently invited Shestov, a critic of his, to lunch. This was an occasion in which Husserl invited one into his phenomenology and tried to show what it was.

The Amsterdam Lectures clearly do not have the depth, detail, and greatness of such masterworks of Husserl as the *Logical Investigations*, *Ideas 1–3*, the *Formal and Transcendental Logic, Cartesian Meditations,* or the *Crisis of the European Sciences.* The strong point of the Amsterdam Lectures is that they represent an effort by the mature Husserl to address an international audience, and they sum up in the clearest and most persuasive terms possible in four hours of intense lectures Husserl's vision of phenomenology and phenomenological psychology: their definition, their methods, and what they can offer a listener/reader willing to take them up and work with them. Husserl wrote many introductions to his phenomenology, but for the reasons presented here, and perhaps for other reasons, also, the Amsterdam Lectures should be of continuing interest to English-speaking readers of Husserl.

THE AMSTERDAM LECTURES <ON> PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY

translated by Richard E. Palmer[1]

PART I. PURE PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY: ITS FIELD OF EXPERIENCE, ITS METHOD, ITS FUNCTION

<§ 1. The Two Senses of Phenomenology: As Psychological Phenomenology and as Transcendental Phenomenology.>

At the turn of the century as philosophy and psychology struggled for a rigorously scientific method, there arose what was at once a new science and a new method both of philosophical and psychological research. The new science was called phenomenology because it, or its new method, was developed through a certain radicalizing of an already existing phenomenological method which individual natural scientists and psychologists had previously demanded and practiced. The sense of this method in men like Mach and Héring lay in a reaction against the threatening groundlessness of theorizing in the exact natural sciences. It was a reaction against a mode of theorizing in mathematical speculations and concept-forming which is distant from intuition, a theorizing which accomplished neither clarity with insight, in any legitimate sense, nor the production of theories.

Parallel to this we find in certain psychologists, and first in Brentano, a systematic effort to create a rigorously scientific psychology on the basis of

---

[1] The text of this translation is from Husserliana IX: 302–349. The elaborate listing of Husserl's cross-outs in the manuscript, pp. 615–624, has not been included in this translation, although some contentual notations or Husserl's marginal comments have been retained as footnotes. All translator's footnotes have been so indicated. Editorial insertions by the German editor (Walter Biemel) are indicated by triangular brackets. Otherwise, the footnotes are taken from *Hu* IX. The pages of the *Hu* IX German source-text have also been indicated in this translation as follows: /303/ marks the beginning of p. 303 in the German text.

pure internal experience and the rigorous description of its data ("Psychognosia"). It was the radicalizing of these methodic tendencies (which, by the way, were already quite often characterized as "phenomenological") [303] more particularly in the sphere of the mental [or psychical, *das Psychische*] and in the rational-theoretical sphere which was at that time in general interwoven with it, which led to a quite novel method of investigation of the purely mental[2] and at the same time to a quite novel treatment of questions that concern specific principles of philosophy, out of which there began to surface, as we mentioned before, a quite new way of being scientific [*eine neuartige Wissenschaftlichkeit*].

In the further course of its development it [the phenomenological] presents us with a double sense of its meaning: on the one hand, as *psychological phenomenology*, which is to serve as the radical science fundamental to psychology; on the other hand, as *transcendental phenomenology*, which for its part has in connection with philosophy the great function of First Philosophy; that is, of being the philosophical science of the sources from which philosophy springs.

In this first lecture, we want to leave out of play all our philosophical interests. We will be interested in the psychological in the same way as a physicist is interested in physics. With pure objectivity in the spirit of positive science, we will weigh the requirements for a scientific psychology and develop the necessary idea of a phenomenological psychology.

§ 2. Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology.

Modern psychology is the science of the real events [*Vorkommnisse*, what comes forward] arising in the concrete context of the objective and real world, events which we call "mental" [*psychische*]. The most exemplary way in which the "mental" [*Psychische*] shows itself arises in the living self-awareness of what I designate as "I" [or ego] and of indeed everything that shows itself to be inseparable from an "I" [or ego] as a process lived by an "I" or as mental processes (like experiencing, thinking, feeling, willing), but also as ability and habit. Experience presents the mental as a dependent stratum of being to man and beast, who are at a more fundamental level physical realities. Thus psychology becomes a dependent branch of the more concrete sciences of anthropology or zoology, and thus encompasses both the physical and psychophysical.

---

[2] Translator's note: Because of associations in English of "psychic" phenomena with weird events in parapsychology, I have here rendered *das Psychische* as "the mental." It can also be translated as "the psychical," but in English "psychic ability," again, is generally taken to refer to the ability to see into the future or read minds, which is decidedly not Husserl's meaning.

If we examine the world of experience in its totality, we find that its nature is to articulate itself into an open infinity of concrete single realities. According to its nature, [304] to each single particular belongs a physical corporality, at least as a relatively concrete substratum for the extra-physical characteristics that are possibly layered on it, to which belong, for example, the determining factors through which a physical body becomes a work of art. We can abstract consistently from all extra-physical determinations, and that signifies that we regard every reality and the whole world purely as physical Nature. In this there lies a structural law of the world of experience. Not only does every concrete worldly or real thing have its nature, its physical body, but also all bodies in the world form a combined unity, a unity which in itself is linked together into infinity, a unity of the totality of Nature which possesses the unifying form of spatiotemporality. From the correlated standpoint of method this is expressed as follows: A consistently abstractive experience can be continuously and exclusively directed to the physical and on this basis of physical experience one can practice an equally self-contained theoretical science, the physical science of nature – physical in the widest sense, to which thus also belong chemistry, and also physical zoology and biology, abstracting away from it whatever pertains to the spirit [*Geistigkeit*].

Now the question obviously arises as to how far it is possible within an interest one-sidedly directed to the mental in brute animals and in the world as such, which we grant never emerges autonomously, for there to be an experience and theoretical inquiry which consistently and continuously moves from mental to mental and thus never deals with the physical. This question leads, further, into another: to what extent is a consistent and pure psychology possible in parallel with a consistent and purely developed empirical natural science? This latter question is apparently to be answered in the negative: Psychology in its customary sense as an empirical science of matters of fact cannot, as the parallel would demand, be a pure science of matters of mental fact purified of everything physical in the way that empirical natural science is purified of everything mental.

No matter how far pure mental experience may reach, and no matter how far by means of it a [pure] theorizing may be effected, it is certain from the very outset that the purely mental to which it [pure mental experience] leads still has its spatiotemporal determinations in the real world, [305] and that in its concrete factualness, like everything real as such, it is only determinable through local spatiotemporal determinants. Spatiotemporality as system of places [*Stellensystem*] is the form [*Form*] of all actual, factual being, of being within the world of matters of fact. And so it follows from this that all determination of concrete facts is founded on spatiotemporal determinations of place. Spatiotemporality, however, belongs primordially and immediately to nature as physical nature. Everything outside the physical, in particular every-

thing mental, can belong to the spatiotemporal situation [*Lage*] only through a grounding [*Fundierung*] in physical corporality. Accordingly, it is easy to grasp that within empirical psychology a completely psychological inquiry can never be isolated theoretically from the psychophysical. In other words: Within psychology as an objective, matter-of-fact science, an empirical science of the mental cannot be established as a self-contained discipline. It can never let go of all thematic consideration of and connection to the physical or psychophysical.

On the other hand, it is clear that investigation into the purely mental is, nevertheless, in some measure possible, and has to play a role in any empirical psychology which strives for a rigorously scientific character. How otherwise is one to attain rigorously scientific concepts of the mental in terms of its own essence and without regard to all its concrete interwovenness with the physical? If we reflect on the fact that to these concepts there must also necessarily belong concepts which encompass the universal and necessary eidetic form of the mental in its ownmost essential character – which are concerned with all of that without which something like the mental would simply not be thinkable – then there opens up the prospect of a possible a priori science of essences belonging to the mental purely as such. We take this as our guiding idea. It would not be parallel to physics as an empirical science of nature but to a science of the apriori conceivable Nature as such in its own pure essence. Although one does not [ordinarily] speak of apriori natural science, it is nevertheless very familiar in the form of certain important particular disciplines, such as the apriori doctrine of time, or as pure geometry and mechanics. [306]

<§ 3. The Method of Pure Psychology (Intuition and Reflection); Intentionality as the Fundamental Characteristic of the Mental.>

Apriori truths are not so easy to arrive at as we thought in earlier times. They arise as authentic eidetic truths in apodictic insight only from out of their original sources in intuition. These sources, however, must be disclosed in the right way. They can only become fruitful [useful] by means of methodical formulation and through completely unfolding their horizons. Consequently, a real grounding is needed for our guiding idea of an a priori and pure psychology which goes back to the experiencing intuition, an intuition methodically dealt with and allsidedly disclosed, an intuition in which the mental is presented to us in its original concrete givenness, in which it becomes apparent, as we also said, in its ownmost essential selfhood. In this process, the thing placed individually before our eyes functions as an example. Our attention is directed from the very outset to what preserves itself within the free variation

of the example and not to what is randomly changing.

The specific character of the method one must follow here will gradually disclose itself to us. First, because it is foundational [*das Fundierende*], comes exemplary experience – real and possible examples. And purely mental experience especially requires a method [for its proper study].

1. Every experiencing or other kind of directedness towards the mental takes place in the mode of reflection. To live as ego-subject is to "live through" the mental in multiple ways. But this, our lived-through life, is, so to say, anonymous; it goes on, but we are not focussed on it; it is unexperienced, since to experience something amounts to grasping something in its selfhood. In waking life we are always busied with something, now this, now that, and at the lowest level with the nonmental: Perceiving something means we are occupied with the perceived windmill; we are focussed on it and only on it. In memory we are dealing with the something remembered; in thinking we are occupied with something thought; in our feeling-valuing life, we are occupied with what we are finding beautiful or whatever other value we attach to it; in volitional striving we have to do with ends and means. So straightforwardly occupied as we then are, we "know" nothing of the life-process in play[3] at the time; we "know" nothing of all [307] the various peculiarities which essentially belong to this process so that we are able to have the specific types of being occupied that we have, so that somehow things can be given as bodily present or can arise in memory again with the thoughts, values, goals, and so forth, again can stand in our thematic gaze, and we can in such and such a way be occupied with them. Only reflection, turning one's gaze away from the straightforwardly thematic, makes mental life itself – the highly diverse ways of "being occupied with," "having as a theme," "being conscious of," with all their peculiarities and possible backgrounds – the object of thematic gaze.

In such a reflective perceiving and experiencing, mental life as such, mental life is grasped and itself made a theme which one can work with in a variety of ways. Naturally this new experiencing and making something thematic in reflection is itself also latent but likewise also can be disclosed through still higher reflection.

2. Whatever becomes accessible to us through reflection has a noteworthy general character: that of being consciousness *of* something, of having something as an object of consciousness, or to be aware of it correlatively – we are speaking here of intentionality. This is the essential character of mental life in the full sense of the word, and is thus simply inseparable from it. It is, for example, inseparable from the perceiving that reflection reveals to us, that it is *of* this or that; just as the process of remembering is, in itself, remembering or recalling *of* this or that; just as thinking is thinking *of* this or that thought,

[3] Being busied <or occupied> with something is itself a latent flowing-along.

fearing is *of* something, love is *of* something; and so on. We can also bring in here the language we use in speaking of appearing or having something appear. Wherever we speak of appearing we are led back to subjects to whom something appears; at the same time, however, we are also led to moments of their mental life in which an appearance takes place as the appearing of something, of that which is appearing in it.

In a way, and perhaps stretching the point a little, one can say of every mental process that in it something is appearing to the particular "I" insofar as the "I" is somehow conscious of it. Accordingly, phenomenality, as a characteristic that specifically belongs to appearing and to the thing that appears, would, if understood in this broadened sense of the term, be the fundamental characteristic of the mental. And the pure psychology whose possibility we are now weighing would [308]properly be designated as "phenomenology" and indeed as apriori phenomenology. Naturally such a psychology would also have to deal with ego-subjects, singly and communally, purely as subjects of such a phenomenality and do this in the manner of an apriori discipline.

After this only terminological discussion we now turn back to the question of methodically establishing pure phenomenological experience and disclosing it. "Phenomenological experience" – this is of course nothing but that sort of reflection in which the mental becomes accessible to us in its own special essence. It is reflection carried through consistently and with a purely theoretical concern so that the living, specific, egoic *life*, the life of consciousness, is not just glimpsed fleetingly but explicitly seen in its own proper eidetic components and, as we said above, in the allsidedness of its horizons.

<§ 4. The Meaning of the Concept of Purity [*Reinheit*].>

Here the first question is how this [phenomenological] experience is to be methodically employed so that as a pure experience it will actually lay bare that in the mental which is seen to belong to its own particular essence.

a. The purity of which we are speaking obviously means, first of all, being free of all that is psychophysical. In the psychological focus, mental experiences are taken as concrete moments of animal and first of all human realities; they are always taken as interwoven with the corporeal element in concrete, animal experience. Whatever pertains to this physical or psychophysical experience this must consequently remain out of account, it is not to be dealt with; [rather] we are to practice phenomenological experiencing exclusively and purely, and consider only what it presents, only what becomes explicit in it. Whatever in the mental links it with or places it in Nature is to be left outside the topic. Manifestly, the same goes for deliberations with regard to all

conceivable psychological possibilities, for despite all their being detached from factually experienced actuality, they are still concrete mental possibilities, still [only] data of possible psychological experience.

Here further difficulties await us: to what extent can an actually consistent, pure *phenomenological* experience – actual and, [309] above all, possible – be practiced; and to what extent can one through such a practice of progressively proceeding from some self-given mental [thing] to another self-given mental [thing] eventually reach a unitary and pure field of experience which *in infinitum* never brings that which is outside the essence of the mental with it into the unity of its pure, intuitive context, that is, into the closed realm of possible purely phenomenological intuitions.

b. On the other hand, pure [phenomenological] experience clearly implies abstention from all prejudgments stemming from scientific or other privileged spheres of experience which could render one blind to that which phenomenological reflection actually lays before us, actually makes available to us a progressive cognizance-taking that from the beginning proceeds by pure intuition, that is, one that from the beginning is an explication of examples in all their dimensions, of the purely mental moments implicit in them.

The combination of both these difficulties has been so effective that one can venture the following paradox: In all of modern psychology there has never been an intentional analysis which was fully carried through. And this despite the fact that for centuries psychology has wanted to be based on inner experience and sometimes to be a psychology descriptive of the data of pure consciousness. Here I cannot even exempt Franz Brentano and his school, although it was his epoch-making contribution to have introduced intentionality as the basic descriptive characteristic of the mental. Further, he demanded the construction of an empirical psychology on the foundation of a systematic and from the beginning purely descriptive inquiry into consciousness. But the distinctive meaning and method needed for a pure analysis of consciousness remained hidden from him.

The persistent prejudices that make people unresponsive to what we propose to accomplish arise first of all from the way the natural sciences have served as models for our thinking. In fact, the prevailing naturalization of the mental that has lasted right up to our day, and the way an essential identity of methods in psychology and the natural sciences is assumed to be self-evident [both] arise from this. Historically, these prejudices make their appearance already in the great originators of modern psychology, Descartes and Hobbes, and, most sharply expressed, in Locke's *tabula rasa* interpretation [310] of the life of consciousness as well as in David Hume's concept of consciousness as a bundle of mental data. Brentano's discovery of the intentional character of consciousness broke through the general blindness to it, but it did not overcome the naturalism which overpowered, so to speak, the intentional processes

and blocked the path leading to the true tasks of intentional inquiry. Nor was the period immediately following that any different. The zealous struggle against "mental atomism" did not mean any actual freedom from naturalism with regard to the mental, for the modish recourse to "gestalt-qualities" and "forms of the whole" only characterized a new mode of naturalism. The foundations [*das Prinzipielle*] of a mental naturalism as such (and, included in this, a most broadly conceived sensualism of the inner and outer senses) only gets to be truly understood for what it is and emptied of its seductive power when a pure phenomenological experience is seriously carried through, in other words, an experience in which the proper essence of intentional life is thus disclosed in consistent allsidedness and evidence and can accordingly be brought to a pure description.

Before my methodical instruction about this experience, which is shortly to follow, I would like to note as a prior clarification that the deep source of all our errors lies in the equating of immanent temporality with objective, concrete temporality – an equation which initially seems to press itself on us as self-evident.

Objective time is the extensional form of objective realities, and indeed primarily and authentically of physical nature, which extends through the real world as its structural basis. Mental lived experiences or processes [*die seelische Erlebnisse*], in and of themselves, do not, therefore, either singly or combined into wholes, possess any concretely real uniting form [*reale Einheitsform*] of coexistence and succession of the type one finds in concrete and real spatiotemporality. The form of flowing, or of being in flux in the unity of a stream of consciousness which is proper to their nature is not an actual parallel form to this spatiotemporality. The image of a stream plays a trick on us. Intentional analysis of immanent temporality actually destroys this image and at the same time places its legitimate sense before us. Precisely in so doing, however, every genuine material analogy between analysis of consciousness and analysis of nature, whether physical, chemical, or even biological, falls away, as does the whole analogy between [311] the way of being of consciousness and the "I" of consciousness, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the way of being of nature. The concepts of physical thing and attributes, of whole and part, uniting and separating, cause and effect, and the like, which are logical when applied to Nature, are all of them rooted in the originarily real, that is, in Nature, and therewith in its basic determination, *res extensa*. When they are taken over into the realm of the mental [*zum Psychischen*], i.e., as psycho-logical, these concepts lose what is fundamentally essential to their meaning, and what remain are only the empty husks of formal-logical concepts of object, attribute, composition, and so on.

§ 5. The Purely Mental in Experience of the Self and of Community. The All-Embracing Description of Intentional Processes.

And now we turn to the other material difficulties which hinder the cultivation of a consistent and pure phenomenological experience, difficulties which arise due to its involvement with experience of the physical. We will refrain from any traditional prejudgments, even the most universally obvious ones of traditional logic, which already have perhaps taken from Nature unnoticed elements of meaning. We will hold ourselves resolutely to what phenomenological reflection presents to us as consciousness and object of consciousness, and purely to what comes to actual, evident self-givenness. In other words, we will interrogate exclusively the phenomenological experience, clearly and quite concretely thinking into a reflective experience of consciousness, without interest in determining concretely occurring facts. Such [phenomenological] experience does not have the individual experience [in view], but the *Gestalt* most immediate to all as *Self-Experience*. For only in it is consciousness and the ego of consciousness given in fully original selfhood, as when I perceivingly reflect on my perceiving. I as phenomenologist thus uncover my own living (in the attitude of fantasy, directed toward concrete possibility), my concrete possible living in this or that concretely actual and concretely possible forms. One can can easily see that it is there, on the basis of this immediacy of my self-experience, that all other experience of the mental (always understood as experiencing *intuition*) is founded, pure experience of what is strange or other [*Fremderfahrung*] as well as of the community. So it is quite natural that from the outset the method of taking pure self-experience is treated as the method appropriate to a consistently conceived [312] phenomenological disclosure of oneself. How can we manage to refrain from accepting any components drawn in by experience of what is externally physical, through which then also everything pertaining to the mental life of someone else [*das Fremdpsychische*] would remain *eo ipso* excluded? The experience of something "external" (more clearly: of something "physical") is itself a mental experience but related to the physical through our intentional experience. Naturally the experienced physical thing itself, which is presupposed as what is physically actual in the world – the thingly real with all its real moments – of necessity does not belong to the inventory of essences proper to us in our experiencing life-process. The same holds for any and every consciousness in which the being of something real in the world is meant and accepted, as well as of every activity of consciousness in my natural and practical life.

<§ 6. Phenomenological Reduction and Genuine Experience of Something Internal.>

Thus if I as a phenomenologist wish to deal with pure mental experience and only with it, if I wish to take the life of my consciousness [*Bewußtseinsleben*] in its own pure essentiality as my *universal* and consistent theme and to make it a field for purely phenomenological experiences, then I certainly must leave out of account the totality of the concrete world which was and is continuously accepted in its being by me in my natural, straightforward living; I must thematically exclude it as outside the being of the mental. That is to say: as phenomenologist I may not in my descriptive practice, in the practice or exercise of pure experience of something mental, I may not exercise in a natural way my believing in the world; rather in further consequence I must dispense with all the position-taking which plays its natural role in the natural, practical life of my consciousness.

On the other hand, it is clear and has already been emphasized, that it belongs to and is inseparable from perception as intentional mental experience that it is perception of what is perceived, and this goes for every kind of consciousness with regard to what it is conscious of. How could we describe a perception, or a memory, or anything else in regard to its own peculiar essence as this concrete mental experience without also saying that it is perception *of* this or that, and is precisely of *this object*? This is manifestly so, quite apart from the question of whether the perceived landscape actually exists, or if, as further experience may show, it proves to be illusionary. [313] Even in an illusion the illusionary landscape still appears, but if we recognize it as illusionary, as appearing in an altered mode of our believing, according to which, although it *appears* the same to us, it does not have the status of simple actuality but that of nullity, of a negated actuality.

Now let us link the conclusion just reached with the one we arrived at earlier. According to the earlier assertion, a mere reflection on consciousness does not yet yield the mental in purity and in its own essentiality. Rather, we must in addition abstain from that believing in being [*Seins-Glaubens*] by virtue of which we accept the world in the natural life of consciousness and our reflecting on it; as phenomenologists, we are not permitted to go along with this (and in further consequence, indeed, we must abstain from every position-taking of any kind toward the world naïvely accepted by us). As phenomenologists we must be as it were *non-participating onlookers* at the life of consciousness, which can only in this way become the pure theme of our experiencing. Instead of living in and through consciousness, instead of being interested in the world in it, we must merely look at it, as if it, in itself, is consciousness of this or that, and at [precisely] how it is interested in its objects. Otherwise, the extra-mental world and not pure consciousness of it

would constantly be included in the theme of our description. Now on the other hand we have said that this act of abstention, this "*epoché*," changes nothing about it, and that every consciousness has in and of itself its own objectivity as such, in which things are appearing and are known in such and such a way. Or better, we now say that precisely through this phenomenological *epoché* what appears stands out as an appearing thing, what is known in that particular consciousness stands out as such, as something which *itself belongs to one's mental inventory*. The externally experienced thing as such, the thing we are conscious of in some way as meant, is accordingly not something that in this instance simply exists, or that is simply possible, probable or non-existent; rather, it is the specific intuitive or non-intuitive *content* that is meant as existent, supposed, or non-existent. This is the meaning of the customary talk in phenomenology about *parenthesizing* [or *bracketing*]. Placing something in parentheses [or brackets] mentally serves as the index of the *epoché*. But inside the parentheses there is that which is parenthesized.

One matter that should be paid attention to: The faith we have in our experiencing, which is at work in whatever specific consciousness one is now having and is precisely there in an unthematized and concealed way, naturally belongs, along with all its further modes of position-taking, [314] to the phenomenological content of that moment of mental process. But such belief is, as such, only disclosed and not "participated in" by me as phenomenologist; as a moment of mental experience, it becomes thematic for me through the fact that I take up the phenomenological focus, which means that I move out of the naïve and natural practice of taking this or that position, to one of holding back from it and I become, as mere spectator, an observing ego.

This describes in substance the necessary and consciously practiced method of access to the realm of pure phenomena of consciousness, namely that peculiar change of focus which is called the phenomenological reduction. By means of it our gaze was directed toward a principal aspect of pure phenomena of consciousness, which is the noematic (and about which traditional psychology did not know what to say). Through the phenomenological reduction intentional objectivities as such were first laid open. They were laid open as an essential component of all intentional processes and as an infinitely fruitful theme for phenomenological description.

But I must immediately add that the universality of the phenomenological *epoché* as practiced by the phenomenologist from the very beginning – the universality in which he or she becomes the mere impartial observer of the totality of his conscious life-process – brings about not only a thematic purification of the individual processes of consciousness and thereby discloses its noematic components; it further directs its power on the ego of consciousness, which it frees of everything concretely human, everything animally real. If all of Nature is transformed into a mere noematic phenomenon in that its concrete

reality is suspended, then the ego, which has now been reduced to pure mental being and life-process, is no longer the concrete, material, creaturely ego we normally speak of; that is, the human ego of the natural, objective, experiential focus. Rather, it has now itself become the intended real thing *as intended only*; it has become a noematic phenomenon.

Everything meant or intended as such, and this includes my being as a human creature in the world and my process of living in the world, is, remember, something intended within an intending life-process; one which, thanks to the phenomenological focus on the purely mental, the life-process in "reduced" form, is [315] inseparable from it as its intentional sense. Naturally this intending life-process is always and continuously to be found in the field of phenomenological reflection.

<§7. The Ego-Pole as Center of Acts of the Ego. The Synthetic Character of Consciousness.>

The consistent unfolding of the noema, of the intended thing as such in each separate case, can be redirected into an examination and analysis of the relatively hidden noesis in it – that is, of the particular process of holding something in consciousness. But still there is something it can call its own: that is the ego-center, the *ego* ["I"] in the *cogito* ["I think"]; I have in mind the ego that remains phenomenologically identical in all the multiple acts of the ego – the ego apprehended as the radiating center from which, as the identical ego-pole, the specific acts [of the ego] radiate forth. For example, when I look at a thing actively, in experiencing I explicate it, I comprehend and judge it, and so on.

The ego-pole is, however, not only the point from which my acts stream forth but also a point into which my emotions and feelings stream. In both respects the phenomenologically pure ego-center remains a great phenomenological theme which is ultimately interwoven with everything else. To me this is evidence that all consciousness is consciousness belonging to my ego. This also carries with it the idea that consciousness in all its forms, in all the modes of active and passive participation of the ego, carries out noematic functions and therewith ultimately is joined into the unity of a context of functions; in this, what is already expressed is the fact that all analysis of consciousness has to do with, at the same time and ultimately even if implicitly, the central ego.

Now among the specific themes in connection with studying the ego there are *Vermögen* [ability to do something] and *Habitus* [tendency to do something], and really, in ways which cannot be gone into here, these are phe-

nomenological themes. But for phenomenological research what is of necessity nearest and first (and indeed as continuous and explicating flow of experience) is the pure life-process itself of the ego – the variegated life of consciousness as the streaming forth of the acts of that ego in such activities as are designated "I perceive," "I remember," – in short, "I experience," "I make something present to myself in a non-intuitive way," or also "I live in free fantasizing," in the sense that "I am engaged" also in the modes in which my valuing, striving, and dealing consciousness occupies itself. The [316] theme that runs through all of these is the essential [reciprocal] two-sidedness of consciousness [on one hand] and what one is conscious of, as such, the noetic and the noematic.

The fundamentally essential difference between the way of being of consciousness in its phenomenological purity in contrast to the way of being in which Nature is given in the natural focus can be seen above all in the ideality of the holding back or being in a suspended state which characterizes the noematic components of a specific consciousness. It is also seen, we can say, in the uniqueness of that synthesis by which every consciousness is unified in itself and again by which one consciousness is united with another into the unity of a [single, unitary] consciousness. The different kinds of synthesis ultimately all point back to identifying syntheses [*Identitätssynthesen*]. Every lived experience [*Erlebnis*] in our consciousness is a consciousness of something. But this involves the fact that there are also given in and with every lived experience in consciousness many others (ideally speaking there are an infinite variety of other such experiences) which are marked out as real or possible, each of which is united with it, or would be united with a consciousness which was consciousness of that same something. When, for instance, I have as a mental experience, the perception of a house, there "resides" within it (and is right there within it itself if we "interrogate" it, as I would like to show) the fact that the same house (the same noema) can be intended in an appertaining multiplicity of other perceptions and in all sorts of other modes of consciousness as the same house. Precisely the same holds for every other kind of consciousness as consciousness of the objectivity of its noema. Through this, the intentional relation demonstrates even more firmly its fundamental nature. The "something" to which it is related as that which it is and that of which the consciousness in question is conscious – or to which the ego is related in a way appropriate to consciousness – this is a noematic pole which serves as an index or reference-point for an open, infinite manifold of ever again other experiences in consciousness, for which it would be absolutely and identically the same thing. And so it belongs to the fundamental nature of consciousness that this object-pole, indeed that every noematic unity is an *ideally* identical thing in all the mental experiencing making up its synthetic multiplicity, and in everything is thus not contained really but "ideally."

I say it is contained ideally. In fact, the manifold consciousness is generally *separated* in the stream of consciousness and thus has no concrete individually identical moment in common [with it]. But yet it becomes apparent [317] in a very evident way that in one and in the other instance we are conscious of the same thing; one and the same house intended perceptually or otherwise is still the same house, noematically understood as the same intended object, both inseparably belonging to each of the multiple appearances yet at the same time being nothing less than a real moment. In other words, we can say that it [the house as ideal object] is immanent in consciousness as sense. In fact, in whatever other way we may speak of sense, it has to do with an ideal something which can be the object of intention throughout an open infinity of possible and actual intentional experiences. This is probably the reason that every analysis of consciousness begins by explicating the concrete, individual lived experience and makes its demonstrations from it. Yet these analyses always and necessarily lead from the individual conscious experience into the corresponding synthetic cosmos [*Universum*] of lived experiences in consciousness. Indeed, without laying claim to this cosmos that which lies noematically within consciousness and at which they are aimed as an intentional objectivity cannot be explained at all.

Accordingly, intentional analysis is totally different both in method and in what it accomplishes from an analysis of concrete data, of what is concretely given. For example, using the phenomenological approach to describe the perceived thing as such means first and foremost, taking as one possibility the previous example of the perceived house, to go into the various descriptive dimensions which, as we soon see, necessarily belong to every noema, although in various particularizations. The first [point] is the directedness of our gaze toward the ontic component of the noema. Looking at the house itself we focus on the various distinguishing features and of course we look exclusively at those which really show themselves in this perception itself. But when we express the matter in this way, we are taking it as self-evident that beyond the actual perceptual moments, the perceived house still possesses a multiplicity of other moments not yet grasped. So then the question about the basis for speaking in this way immediately leads to the fact that to the noema of the perceived house belongs a horizon consciousness; in other words, what is genuinely seen in itself refers us in its "sense" to an open "more" of determinations which are unseen, partly known, partly undetermined and unknown. The analysis cannot stop at this point, however. The [318] question immediately arises as to how come it is evident that this pointing-ahead belongs to the phenomenon-in-consciousness? How come this horizon-consciousness refers us in fact to further actually unexperienced traits of the same [phenomenon]? Certainly this is already an interpretation which goes beyond the moment of experiencing, which we have called the "horizon-consciousness," which is,

indeed, as is easily determined, completely non-intuitive and thus in and of itself empty. But we are immediately drawn into a disclosure or fulfillment [of sense] which [shows] itself as evident from the given perception precisely by means of a series of fantasy variations which offer a multiplicity of possible new perceptions projected as possible: [that is,] a synthetically annexed and joined set of fantasy variations in which it becomes evident to us that the empty horizon with which the sense of the perception is freighted, in fact carries within it an implicit perceptual sense; that, in fact, it is an anticipatory sketching out of new moments which belongs to the way of being of the perceived, a sketching out which is still undetermined but determinable, and so on.

The explication of the intentional sense thus leads, under the heading of horizon-explication (explication of anticipations), from the explication of a sense that is already intuitively verified to the construction of an eidetically appertaining synthetic manifold of possible perceptions of that same thing. Constructively we produce a chain of possible perceptions which show how the object would look and would have to look if we perceptually pursued it further and further. In this regard, however, it also becomes evident that the same house, continued, that we just spoke of, that is, the same *ontic* house (as an identical link in the chain of multiple possible noemas) separates itself and distinguishes itself from the "house" [that is given] in the "how" of intuitive realization; each of the individual perceptions of the same house brings the same thing forward within a subjective "how" [how it appears], bringing with it namely a different set of actually seen determinations of it. This holds true in a similar way for the other descriptive dimensions of a noema of external experience; for example, those under the heading of a "*perspective.*" Whatever in the perceived thing comes forward in the actual intuition does so in such a way that every genuinely intuitive moment has *its* mode of givenness; for instance, what is visually given will be in a certain perspective. And with this, the perspective again immediately points toward possible new [319] perspectives of the same thing, and we are again drawn, only looking now in another direction, into the system of possible perceptions.

Another descriptive dimension has to do with the *modes of appearance* [*Erscheinungsmodi*], which, through the possible differences in essence among perception, retention, recalling again, prior expectation, and so on, are all determined by the same thing. This, too, leads, as will be demonstrated, to a kind of intentional explication, one which by means of the specifically given lived experience leads constructively beyond it into methodical clarifications which consist of constructing appertaining synthetic multiplicities. Again, the same thing holds with regard to the descriptive dimension that is characterized by its separating sense material from the mode of [its] acceptance. All of these dimensions are determined in accordance with the horizon and require a

disclosure of the horizon and of the levels and dimensions of sense that are made clear through this disclosure.

This should suffice to make it evident that the truly inexhaustible tasks of an intentional analysis within a phenomenological psychology have a totally different sense from the customary analyses in the objective, let us say, natural sphere. Intentional explication has the unique peculiarity belonging to its essential nature, that is as an interpretive exegesis [*Auslegung*] of noesis and noema. Interpreting [is taken of course] in a broader sense and not in the sense of merely analyzing an intuited concrete thing into its component traits.

One more corroborating operation should be carried out. Up to this point the analysis of properties was what we have had in mind. But "analysis" often and in the literal sense means breaking something down into its parts. [It is true that] lived experiences in consciousness do have, in their immanent temporality within the stream of consciousness taken concretely but purely, a kind of real partitioning and a correlative real connection [with each other]. But it would certainly be foolish to want to look at the connecting and partitioning in consciousness exclusively from the viewpoint of putting parts together and taking them apart. For example, a concrete perception is the unity of an immanent flowing along in which each of the component parts and phases allows of being distinguished from one another. Each such part, each such phase, is itself again a consciousness-of, is itself again perception-of, and as this, has its own perceptual sense. But not, let us say, in such a way that the individual senses can simply be put together into the unitary sense [320] of the whole perception. In every component of a perception flowing along as a phase of a whole perception, the object is perceived whose unity of meaning extends through all the meanings (senses) of the phases and, so to say, nourishes itself from them in the manner of gaining from them the fullfilment of more exact determination – but this is by no means a mere sticking things together, and it is anything but merely the type of combination into a whole which is to be found in sensible forms. For not every synthesis in consciousness exists as this type of continuous synthesis (and the substratum for corresponding analyses of phases and parts). But in general it is valid to say that consciousness as consciousness permits no other manner of linking to another consciousness than such synthesis, such that every partitioning down into parts again produces meaning or sense, just as every combining generates a synthetically established sense. Synthesis of meaning or sense – synthesis of an ideally existent thing – stands generally under quite different categories from those of real synthesis, and real totality.

The life of consciousness constantly flows along as a life that is sense-constituting in itself and which also constitutes sense from sense. In ever new levels these objectivities are carried out within pure psychological subjectivity, a production and a transformation of "objectivities" appearing to the

conscious ego determining itself as so and so, nearer or "other" and accepted by it as being so, but in the most varied modes of validity. A kind of ongoing synthesis which is especially close to the essential nature of a coherently interrelated life of consciousness, and in fact always necessarily belongs to it, is the synthesis of all experiences into the unity of one experience; and within this, the synthesis of concordant experience, interrupted to be sure by discords but always through correction restoring again the form of an all-bracing harmony. All the kinds and forms of reason *in cognition* [*erkennender Vernunft*] are forms of synthesis, of accomplishment of unity and truth by cognizing subjectivity. To shed light on the intentional is a huge task for phenomenological-psychological research.

The descriptive phenomenology which we have been speaking of up to now as in itself first was *egological* phenomenology. In it we conceived of an ego disclosing its own pure mental being, its realm in the strictest sense as original experience of the mental. Only after an egological-phenomenological [321] inquiry that has been pressed sufficiently far does it become possible to broaden the phenomenological method in such a way that experience of someone else and of the community is introduced into it. Then and only then does the insight disclose itself that an *all-embracing* phenomenology is to be carried through in consistent purity, and that only in this way is intentional psychology at all possible – that the unity of synthesis encompasses the individual subjects as a phenomenology of intersubjectivity.

Not only is the conscious life of an individual ego a field of experience that is enclosed in itself and needs to be gone through step-by-step in phenomenological experience; the all-embracing conscious life which, reaching beyond the individual ego, also links each ego to every other in real and possible communication is like this.

Instead of thematizing the psychophysical experience of humankind passing from man to man and to animals in one's activity and in this way regarding this experience as mediated by nature and realities connected with nature out there in the world, one can, rather, start from one's own immanent life-process and go through the intentionality contained within it in such a way that a purely phenomenological continuity in experiences from one subject to another subject is produced and purely preserved. It is the intentionality in one's own ego which leads into the alien ego and is the so-called "empathy," and one can put it into play in such phenomenological purity that Nature remains constantly excluded from it.

§ 8. The Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as Eidetic Science.

What we have discussed so far has dealt with the method by which a pure psychological sphere of experience reveals itself as a field of purely mental data, a field that needs to be described, a field that is self-disclosing in continuous intentional explication. In this connection we will also speak in a general way of common and essentially fundamental peculiarities which are to be encountered in this field. Nevertheless, as long as we remain within mere experience, thus clinging to singular facts and to the empirical generalizations arising from them as these are formed naturally in the course of experience, as long as our description retains the character of a mere empirical description, we do not yet have a science.

[322] We already know that a pure phenomenological psychology as a science of real facts is not possible. For such a science the purely mental facts that are revealed through phenomenological method would require a methodology that goes after their "real" [external, concrete] meaning, that is to say takes account of their physical signification, and therewith enters into the realm of the psychophysical. This lies outside our theme. But, as we predicted, now, by virtue of our having opened up the realm of pure intersubjectivity, revealed with phenomenological consistency and purely practiced experience as a unity, and indeed as a reality and possibility, an apriori science can be established: a self-contained, pure phenomenological apriori psychology.

But how is a phenomenological apriori arrived at? One must not here think of an effusive mysticism of logic. Rather, the method of gaining a pure apriori is a completely sober, well-known method readily available in all sciences, however much a reflective clarification and final explication of the meaning of this method may be lacking – a clarification and explication which can only be brought about for all methods of cognition through a pure phenomenology. It is the method of attaining to pure universals [*Allgemeinheiten*, generalizations] intuitively and apodictically, universals free of all co-positing of concrete *fact*, which are related to an infinite range of freely conceivable possibilities as purely possible facts. Indeed, [it is a method] which prescribes apodictically the norm of being conceivable as possible fact. Once brought to light these pure universals, even if they are not generated through strictly logical methods, are pure pieces of self-evident knowledge which can be tested at any time by asking whether it is conceivable that they be otherwise without there arising in insight a contradiction or absurdity. A parallel example in the sphere of nature is the insight that everything that is intuitively imaginable as pure possibility, or, as we say, everything conceivable possesses the fundamental spatiotemporal and causal properties of a *res extensa* [extended thing]: spatial and temporal dimensions, spatiotemporal location, and so on.

Now how is it that we come to know such things? Well, we start out from some exemplary thing or other, perhaps of factual experience, and then, leaving its factuality out of play as irrelevant, we practice free fantasy-variation with our specific example, producing a consciousness of free optionality [*Beliebigkeit*] and a horizon of optionally produceable variations. This is, however, only a rough beginning, [323] and a more thorough investigation shows that it is only suitable for regional universals when qualified by more exact corresponding explication. In this [explication] there will come to the fore in the constant overlapping or coincidence within the variants an all-encompassing essential form running through them, an invariant which preserves itself necessarily through all the variations. And not only does it preserve itself as something that is factually held in common in the concrete variations intuitively produced but also as an invariant in the optionality of ongoing variation "as such." And every thing-factum in experience, insofar as it is the theme of such intuitively fulfilled free variations possesses an evidentially emerging, necessary, and simply indestructible formstyle [*Formstil*] which emerges in this very natural method of proceeding as the formstyle belonging to all things in the region of "thing" as such.

In exactly the same way, proceeding from examples of phenomenological experience or possibilities of experience, obviously we can practice free variations and, ascending to the pure and necessary *as such,* delimit the purely and simply invariant style [*Stil*] of phenomenological subjectivity, as [the general forms of] a pure ego and a community of egos as such, a life-process of consciousness as such, with noesis and noema as such, and so on. And so in this way the phenomenologist continuously carries out not only the phenomenological reduction as method of disclosive experiencing but also an "eidetic reduction." Phenomenology then becomes an all-encompassing science, related to the continuously unified field of phenomenological experiencing, but rigorously focussed on investigating its invariant formstyle, its infinitely rich a priori-structure, the apriori of a pure subjectivity, both as single subjectivity within an intersubjectivity as well as a single subjectivity in itself. No "I" [or ego] is conceivable without consciousness of being an "I" [*Ichbewusstsein*] and none is conceivable without perception, recollection, expectation, thinking, valuing, acting, etc.; none without fantasizing in which all such consciousness is transformed into "as if". No perception is conceivable that would not again have perception as its formstyle. And this holds [also] for the other categories of consciousness.

All concepts and propositions that arise in this way are a priori in the same sense as, for example, purely logical and mathematical truths. A genuine apriori presupposes here as well as everywhere else, that variation and transition to the unconditioned generality as such, to free optionality, as mode of consciousness, does not move into a vague [324] thinking of ideational pro-

jections fabricated from words but rather into actual intuitions, in constructing intuitions which are actually examples that must be unveiled within operative experience exactly to the extent that they can be used for arriving at a pure universal. In regard to the phenomenological experience with its horizons of intentional implication, this means that access to the genuine apriori is very difficult. Phenomenological experience as explicitly such is itself a matter of accomplishing difficult methodical functions. Practicing the method of variation in the egological focus produces, first of all, the system of invariants in one's own ego, unrelated to the question of the intersubjective accessibility, and validity, of this apriori. If one brings into consideration the experience of others, then what becomes clear is that it belongs a priori to the objective sense of that experience (thus, <as it is> to the alter ego) that the other be analogous in its essence with my *ego*; that the other, then, necessarily has the same essence-style <*Wesensstil*> as I. In this way, egological phenomenology is valid for every ego whatever, not just valid for me and my fantasy-variants. After the reduction has been broadened to include phenomenologically pure intersubjectivity, then a universal apriori for communities of subjects becomes apparent in the reduction of them to their inner-phenomenological and pure unity.

§ 9. The Essential Function of Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Psychology.

The apriori concepts generated by eidetic reduction are an expression of the necessary essence of the structure [*Stilform*] to which all conceivable, factual, egoic being and the life of consciousness is tied. All empirical-phenomenological concepts take their place among them [the apriori concepts just mentioned] as logical forms, in the same way as all empirical concepts in which natural science's factual assertions proceed participate at the same time in the apriori concepts governing Nature. Thus, the unconditional normative validity of the apriori truths grounded in apriori concepts for all their respective regions of being, in this case for purely mental *empeiria* [facts] to which these concepts pertain, is self-evident.

Here we add what quite naturally comes next: a discussion of the significance of a phenomenological psychology for the much more far-reaching subject of psychology in general. Phenomenological [325] psychology is the unconditionally necessary foundation for the construction of a rigorously scientific psychology which would be the genuine and actual analogue of exact natural science. The exactness of exact natural science [natural science] lies in its being grounded on its apriori, within each of its own disciplines,

even if this is not a completely projected system of forms for a conceivable Nature as such. Through this theoretical relating-back of the factual in experience to this apriori of form, the vague *empeiria* [items experienced] gain a share in essential necessity, and the natural scientific method as a whole gains a sense that it is undergirding with "exactness" all the vague concepts and rules; that is, to mould the particulars, which can only be brought out and determined in the light of experienceable matters of fact, to the measure of apriori form; which as such prescribes to everything empirical, insofar as it is to be "objective," a necessity within the totality of Nature.[4] The fact that the apriori is here quantitative, expressed in size and number, is simply due to the essence of Nature as Nature.

But exactness in the more general sense is demanded for every genuine science of facts, [and thus] also for psychology. It, too, has its all-governing fundamental concepts; or [what is] the same thing, even the experiential realm dealt with by psychology has its apriori set of structural types, and standing in first place, obviously, is the set of structural types of the mental in the specific sense – the apriori without which an ego (and a community of egos) would simply be inconceivable to consciousness [as would also] objectivity in consciousness, an apriori prior to all the contingencies of factual phenomenological experience. Eidetic-psychological phenomenology uncovers this apriori according to all the sides and dimensions which belong to noesis and noema. Thus, it produces the *fundamental rational concepts* which extend through every conceivable psychology, so far as it is in fact psychology, that is to say it has to do with the mental, with ego and intentionality, and so on.

But obviously this apriori phenomenology we have just described, even though it is in itself the first foundational science of exactness, does not exhaust the whole of apriori psychology, in so far as psychology remains a science of the mental as it makes its appearance in the given world as real moment [of experience] and [326] which as a psycho*physical* [emphasis added] datum fits itself into and is coordinated with Nature. As such a science, psychology finds itself co-founded on the apriori of Nature. It rests, therewith, on both the empirical and the apriori natural science and is grounded in its own apriori, which has to belong to the psychophysical as such, but which has never been worked out.[5]

A pure phenomenological psychology, as we indicated earlier, only makes sense as an eidetic science. On the other hand, we now see that any genuine and, in the good sense, exact psychology – or better any psychology which is to possess the form of a rational science of facts according to the type of

---

[4] Here is underlined the necessary recourse to idealization and hypothesis of idealization!

[5] Logically ideal imagined things are conceivable only in identity within the world and (in general) vice versa. The Apriori is not just lying around in the street and apodicticity must actually be constructed.

rational (here, mathematical) natural science it is – is in a broader sense "phenomenological psychology" in so far as it does not deal with the real mental [*das real Psychische*] on the basis of vague factual experiences defined in vague empirical conceptualities but rather on the basis of an all-embracing phenomenological experience and a doctrine of eidetic phenomenological essences rooted in it – or we could say, on the basis of an apriori logic of psychology that accords with its own essence.

In our presentation here, it could seem as if psychology were one exact, positive science among others and thus as an eidetic science one among others. But no matter how true it is that the mental arises as one among other real components of the world, it still has the amazing quality – precisely that which in phenomenology is investigated in its purity – that it relates, or lets itself be related, *intentionally* [emphasis added] to everything extra-mental as well as everything conceivable at all. Human beings are in the world along with other realities, but human beings also have consciousness of the world, themselves included; it is owing to this that a world is there for us at all, and that it is accepted as existent. Granted, it may appear to be distorted and lawless in the individual case, but in terms of the whole it proves to be lawful and consistent; it may appear theoretically good or bad; it may be determined by us in an insightful or an erroneous way. But the world is what it is for us on the basis of our own functions of consciousness [*Bewußtseinsleistungen*]. The sciences, particularly, are on every level formations [*Gebilde*] produced in intentionality, which produces their sense of being true from the operations of confirmation within the individual [327] subjectivity and within the intersubjective. Scientifically valid theory is a system of intersubjective results which carry a self-constituting and enriching sense of objectivity within subjectivity itself. Theory of science as universal logic, as science of the apriori form [*Form*] of a science as such and of the apriorietically prescribed types (regions) of scientific knowledge [*Wissenschaftstypen*], keeps to the customary meaning of science, namely as theory, as a system of resultant truths.[6] With this [version of science], however, the whole subjective life-process that shapes both truth and science remains outside the topic. Obviously a full and comprehensive theory of science would demand that the function [*Leistung*] be explored as a formation in the functioning [*leistenden*] subjectivity. It would demand that all forms and patterns of scientific (and so also of any type of) rationality be included in the research. Clearly this research would be absolutely requisite to a universal pure phenomenology which comprehended within itself all theory of knowledge, theory of science, and theory of reason.

[Admittedly] this looks like a restoration of psychologism. What is said by it, though, is only that an all-embracing phenomenology – so far as it makes

[6] It is theory of theory.

scientific theory understandable as the "noema" of "noeses" that, in accordance with their essences, necessarily belong to them – also at the same time includes within itself an *all-embracing general psychology of reason* and its functions; alongside, of course, phenomenology of unreason and the whole category of the passive functions of consciousness which carries the label of "association." This phenomenological psychology of reason is, however, in its whole fundamental position unphilosophical. It no more becomes philosophical by starting out relying on the apriori than geometry becomes philosophical by starting out relying on the spatial apriori with respect to space. The theory of reason in positivity, the psychological theory of reason, still belongs to the positive sciences.

Nevertheless, in a certain way not only this psychological theory of knowledge but also the whole of phenomenological psychology stands quite near to philosophy. For, once it is firmly grounded and established in its full all-embracing universality, all that is required is the *Copernican 180° Turn* [i.e., the transcendental reduction] [328] in order to give this whole phenomenology and theory of reason transcendental significance. The radical change of meaning arises through the fact that the constant presupposition upon which the totality of scientific positivity – even that of empirical and phenomenological psychology – rests is put out of play by an *epoché* [bracketing]: Bracketed is the presupposition of a pregiven world, of what, according to common experience, is the self-evidently existing world. In other words: Instead of positing a world in advance, this pregiven world, and then only asking how this self-evidently existing world is to be determined truly, this world is instead treated as noema. Absolutely posited is subjectivity, purely as such, in which the world is constituted and which is now no longer meant as animate subjectivity in the world. In a word, the psychological-phenomenological reduction is transformed into the transcendental-phenomenological [reduction], and therewith psychological phenomenology is transformed into absolute or transcendental phenomenology.

PART II: PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND THE TRANSCENDENTAL PROBLEM

The idea of a purely phenomenological psychology has not only the reformative function for empirical psychology which we have just set forth. It can also, for very deep-seated reasons, serve as a preliminary stage for laying out the idea of a transcendental base-science [*Grundwissenschaft*], a transcendental phenomenology.

§ 10. Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Locke's Psychologism.

Even historically, phenomenological psychology did not develop from the requirements of psychology itself. Although the real breakthrough occurred only at the beginning of our century, the history of phenomenological psychology leads us back to Locke's noteworthy foundational work and very shortly thereafter to the significant working out of impulses from it by G. Berkeley and David Hume. In the Hume's *Treatise* [*Concerning Human Understanding*] already we find a first effort at a systematic phenomenology, a first attempt at a systematic exploration of the sphere of pure lived experience [*Erlebnissphäre*], although admittedly not by means of eidetic method and furthermore involving a contradictory sensualistic [329] set of connections in conscious life as such. Already in classical British philosophy [in Locke], then, the intended limiting [of focus] to the purely subjective sphere was determined by interests external to psychology.

This inward-turned psychology stood in the service of the transcendental problem that had been awakened by Descartes, although this problem was not grasped in genuine form and properly formulated by Descartes himself. Still, in the very first of the Cartesian *Meditations* the thought was there – tangible, underdeveloped, but there and ready to be developed – a thought one can designate as the fundamental impulse of modern philosophy, that which essentially determines its particular style, namely: Every objectively real thing [*alles Reale*], and ultimately the whole world as it exists for us in such and such a way, only exists as an actual or possible *cogitatum* of our own *cogitatio*, as a possible experiential content of our own experiences; and in dealing with the content of our own life of thought and knowing, the best case being in myself, one may assume our own (intersubjective) operations for testing and proving as the preeminent form of evidentially grounded truth. Thus, for us, true being is a name for products of actual and possible cognitive operations, an accomplishment of cognition [*Erkenntnisleistung*].

Here lay the motivation for all the later transcendental problems, bogus as well as the genuine. Right away in Descartes the thought took a form which misled him and succeeding centuries. With seeming self-evidentness he proceeded in the following way: The experiencing and cognizing subjectivity is thrown upon its own resources. Cognition takes place within its own pure immanence. The evidentiality of the *ego cogito*, of pure subjective inner experience, necessarily precedes all other evidences, and in everything is already presupposed. How can I, the cognizing entity in this case, legitimately go beyond the component elements which are given with immediate evidentness to me alone? Obviously only through mediating inferences. What do these mediating inferences look like? What can give them that wonderful capacity to enter a world transcendent to consciousness?

The genuine transcendental problem is further obscured by the realism-problem, which misled centuries of thinkers with those absurd truisms [*Selbstverständlichkeiten*, self-evidentnesses] of a [330] theory based on inferences. All the same, the transcendental problem was prepared for and anticipated; attention was focussed on the all-embracing [*universale*] subjectivity of consciousness and its possession of a world. Descartes' method of doubt can be designated as the first method of exhibiting transcendental subjectivity, at least that of the transcendental ego as a unified self centered in the ego and its cognitive life-process. One can say: it is the first transcendental theory and critique [in the Kantian sense] of universal experience of the world as the foundation for a transcendental theory and critique of objective science.

In unsuccessfully working out the transcendental problem, in the twisting involved in Descartes' wrong formulation of the transcendental problem, the *ego* becomes pure *mens* [mind] as *substantia cogitans* [cognative substance], that is, *mens* as concrete mind [*Seele*] or *animus*, existing for itself yet again something that exists for itself only through causal law and its link with corporeal substance.

Locke, without sensing the depths opened up by the first *Meditations* and the fully new position attained there in relation to world and to mind, took the pure ego from the outset as pure mind-substance [*reine Seele*], as the "human mind," whose systematic and concrete exploration on the basis of evident inner experience was to be the means of solving the questions of understanding and reason. However great his epoch-making contribution was, of having posed this question concretely and in the unity of a scientific-theoretical horizon and of having shown its relationship to the primal foundation in inner experience, still he missed its genuine transcendental meaning because he conceived of it as psychological inner experience.

So he became the founder of psychologism, a science of reason – or as we can also say it in a more general way: a transcendental philosophy on the foundation of a psychology of inner experience.

The destiny of scientific philosophy hinged, and still hinges, on establishing it as genuine transcendental philosophy, or what goes with this, on a radical overcoming of every form of psychologism; a radical overcoming – namely one that lays bare in one stroke what is sense, what is in principle nonsense, and yet what is its transcendentally significant kernel of truth. The source of psychologism's continuous and [331] invincible power through the centuries comes, as will be shown, from drawing on an essential double meaning which the idea of subjectivity and therewith all concepts of the subjective take on, and which arises as soon as the genuine transcendental question is posed. The disclosure of this double sense which links psychological and transcendental subjectivity together, and indeed not accidentally unites them, is brought about when the divorce is accomplished between phenomenological psychology and

transcendental phenomenology – one as rational psychological foundational science and the other as rational foundational science of philosophy in its necessary form as transcendental philosophy. In connection with this, the idea also seems to be justified of phenomenological psychology being projected as an advance guard for and valued as a means of access to transcendental phenomenology.

We begin with clarification of the genuine transcendental problem, which in its initial instability has made us inclined to get sidetracked, and still does.

§ 11. The Transcendental Problem.

The transcendental problem designates an all-embracing [*universales*] problem which is related to the cosmos and all the sciences that deal with our world, but points to a fully new dimension of this in contrast with the Natural universal problem whose theoretical solution is branched out into the positive sciences.

The transcendental problem arises from a general turning around of the natural focus of consciousness, the focus in which the whole of daily life flows along; the positive sciences continue operating in this natural focus. In this focus the "real" world is pregiven to us, on the basis of ongoing experience, as the self-evidently existing, always present to be learned about world to be explored theoretically on the basis of the always onward movement of experience. Everything that exists for us, whatever is or was accepted as an existing thing, belongs to it; not only minds but also the irreal objectivities which are to become our own, like for example linguistic meanings, scientific theories, or even the ideal constructions of art. They still have their existence [*Dasein*] in the world as irreal determinations that exist precisely as [332] meaning or significance of physical word-sounds, or of physical signs, of real marble, and the like.

The constantly present and accepted world before us with all its real and irreal determinations, serves as the universal theme of all our practical and theoretical interests, and, in the final analysis, it is also the theme of positive science. This remains the case, and historically speaking it remained all-pervasive until a motivation became operative which was suited to putting the natural focus (a focus which by reason of its very nature necessarily comes first in the individual and historically) out of play and, in the same move, to compel a new focus, which we call transcendental. Such a motivation arose when, under the aegis of philosophy, there developed a truly all-embracing [*universale*] theoretical interest, in which questions were posed about the universe as such, about the world as the cosmos comprising every existing

thing whatever. It arose also through the fact that philosophical attention was directed toward the life of consciousness [*Bewusstseinsleben*], and became aware that the world which for us is *"the" world*, is on-hand [*vorhanden*], exists for us in this or that way, is *in* this consciousness – as something appearing, meant, legitimated, in *that consciousness* – that same consciousness. As soon as we become aware of this, we are in fact in a new cognitional situation [*Erkenntnislage*]. Every meaning that the world has for us, we now must say – both its undetermined general sense as well as its meaning determined according to concrete particulars – is "intentional" meaning that is enclosed in the innerness of our own experiencing, thinking, valuing life-process, and is a meaning that takes shape within our consciousness. Every acceptance of the validity of being [*Seinsgeltung*] of something is carried out within ourselves; every evidence within experience or theory which grounds that acceptance is living within ourselves and henceforth is habitually motivating us. This holds for the world in every determination, even in the most self-evident, where everything which belongs to the world is "in and for itself" as it is, whether or not I, or whoever, may be accidentally aware of it or not.

Once the world in its full universality has been related to the conscious subjectivity in whose conscious life it makes its appearance as precisely "the" world in its specific meaning at that time, then its mode of being acquires a dimension of unintelligibility and questionability. This "making-an-appearance," this "being-for-us" of the world as something that can only subjectively be brought to acceptance and foundational evidentness, does require clarification. The first [333] awareness of the radical relatedness of world to consciousnness does not, in its empty generality, yield any understanding at all of how consciousness in its multiplicity, in its restless streaming and self-transformation, so contrives that, for example, in the structure of perception there emerges a persisting, real objectivity that belongs to a thing as bodily existing, and as something transcendent to consciousness, that can become known as existing in and for itself, indeed that can even be proved in an evidential way to be there. How can we account for the fact that a *presently* occurring experience in one's consciousness called "recollection" makes us conscious of a *not-present* event and indeed makes us aware of it as past? And how is it that in the "I remember" moment, that sense can be included in an evidential way with the sense: "I have earlier perceived"? How are we to understand the fact that a perceptual, that is to say, bodily characterized present can at the same time contain a co-presence with the sense of a perceivability that goes beyond the [immediate] perceivedness? How are we to understand the fact that the actual perceptual present as a totality does not close out the world but rather always carries within itself the sense of an infinite *plus ultra* [more beyond]? Yet our whole life in the world as conscious life in all its relationships, is not intelligible at all if, instead of engaging in naïve praxis, we

also direct our interest toward the "how" of the functioning [*Leistung*] of consciousness, in order to live along with it in theoretic practice.

When natural reflection directs its gaze on this "how" in the midst of the living functions of anonymous consciousness, it still does not make intelligible this functioning, which appears to lead back into unknown infinities of concealed contexts and connections.

Apparently this problem applies also to every kind of "ideal" world, including the worlds which many sciences have disclosed to us in abstractive separation from all relationship to the real world; such as, for example, the world of pure numbers with its peculiar character of being "in itself," or the world of "truths in themselves."

Unintelligibility enshrouds in an especially painful way the mode of being of our self. We, individually and in cognitive community, are supposed to be the ones in whose conscious life-processes the real and every ideal world should gain meaning and acceptance according to all that they are (as pregiven to us, at hand, and as existing in and for themselves). We ourselves, however, as human creatures, supposedly belong only to the real world. In accordance with the *world*liness of our meanings, we are [334] again referred back to ourselves and the conscious life wherein this special meaning takes shape. Is another way of clarification conceivable than interrogating the life and processes of consciousness itself and the world that we become conscious of through it? Surely it is as something intended by us, and not from any other source, that the world has acquired and always acquires its meaning and its validity. On the other hand, however, *how* are we going to interrogate conscious life without falling into a circle with regard to its reality [*Realität*]? Indeed, before we go any further, here, let's take yet another important step, a step which raises the level of transcendental problem to that of basic principle. This step is to recognize that the demonstrated relativity of consciousness [to the subject] has to do not just with our world as factum but with every conceivable world whatsoever. For if in free fantasy we vary our factual world and transport ourselves into random conceivable worlds, we inevitably also vary *ourselves*, to whom, after all, they are the environing worlds. We transform ourselves each time into a possible subjectivity that would have the particular fabricated world in question as its surrounding world, the world of its possible experiences, the world of its possible theoretical evidentness, of its possible conscious life in every kind of transaction with the world. In this way the problem of the transcendental world is removed from [the sphere of] fact and becomes an eidetic problem to be solved in the sphere of eidetic (apriori) theories.

The same thing holds in a different way for ideal worlds of the type of pure mathematics; for example, the world of numbers. Such worlds we cannot in fantasy think as freely transformed; every such effort leads to the cancellation

of their possibility, which is equivalent to [cancellation of] their actuality. For invariance belongs to their mode of being [*Seinsart*]. But at the same time it is quite evident that it [this mode of being] is not tied to us as *factual* cognizing subjects. As cognizing subjects, we can vary ourselves in such a manner that we posit whatever randomly conceivable theoretical [conscious] subjects we might choose. Every one of these, who as theoretical subject is capable of the free production of theoretical objectivities, could in himself produce formations in consciousness in an evident way which would have as their cognitional result their respective idealities, and so likewise there would result all kinds of ideal worlds like the number series, etc. Thus, as it also relates to such irrealities, the transcendental problem also has from the beginning an *eidetic* meaning and demands eidetic ways of solution.

[335] § 12. The Psychologistic Solution to the Transcendental Problem.

The working out of the idea of an *apriori psychological phenomenology* has demonstrated to us the possibility that one can, through a consistently carried out phenomenological reduction, disclose in eidetic generality the essence proper to mental subjectivity. This includes with it the set of essential types [*Wesenstypik*] for all the forms of evidentness, beginning with the set of essential types for experience which agrees or harmonizes with other experience [*einstimmige Erfahrung*] and, in further consequence, includes the whole structural system of human reason which establishes and preserves law. And in further consequence it would include the essential patterns for possible worlds of experience, or possible systems of harmonizing experiences and the scientific thought established on the basis of them, in whose immanence the subjectivity possible at that time and place constitutes for itself the meaning and legitimacy of a world existing in objective truth. Consequently, phenomenological psychology, systematically carried out, would seem to encompass within itself in radical generality the totality of research on correlations between objective being and consciousness. It gives the appearance of being the proper place for all transcendental clarifications.

But on the other hand we must not overlook the fact that psychology in all its disciplines belongs to the "positive" sciences. In other words: It is from beginning to end a science [carried out] in the natural focus, in which "the" world is continuously pregiven as simply there at hand [*schlechthin vorhandene*] and functions as its general and universal thematic basis. What psychology especially wishes to explore are the minds and communities of minds which present themselves within this pregiven world. The phenomenological reduction serves as a psychological method of obtaining the mental

element of animal realities in their own essentiality, penetrating into their ownmost essential connections and preserving these undamaged.

In eidetic phenomenological research, also, the mental retains the existential sense [*Seinssinn*] appropriate to what is at hand in the world – but now related to possible (conceivable) real worlds. Even as an eidetic phenomenologist, the psychologist is transcendentally naïve. However much he or she may try to put everything psychophysical out of play in directing his/her interest toward the purely mental, these are still actual or possible "minds," minds thought of completely in the relative sense of this word [336] as always the minds of bodies out there, that is to say, mind of concrete human beings in a spatial world.

But if we allow the transcendental interest instead of the natural-worldly interest to become our theoretical standard, then psychology as a whole, like every other positive science, must be labelled as transcendentally problematic [questionable]. Psychology cannot make available any of its premises to transcendental philosophy. The subjectivity of consciousness, which is its topic, *i.e.*, the mental [*seelische*], cannot be that which is inquired back to transcendentally.

At this decisive point everything hinges on whether one keeps in view with unerring seriousness the thematic meaning of the transcendental mode of inquiry.

We have been driven out, expelled, from the naïveté of natural living-along; we have become aware of a peculiar split or cleavage, so we may call it, which runs through all our life-process; namely, that between the anonymously functioning subjectivity, which is continuously constructing objectivity for us, and the always, by virtue of the functioning of anonymous subjectivity, pregiven objectivity, the world. This world also includes within it human beings with their minds, with their human conscious life. When we consider the pervasive and unsuspendable relatedness of the pregiven and self-evidently existing world to our functioning subjectivity, humankind and we ourselves appear as intentionally produced formations whose sense of being objectively real and whose verification of being are both self-constituting in subjectivity. Also, the being of the objective, a being that appeared to the contingent consciousness as "over against" it and "in and of itself," has now appeared as a meaning that constitutes itself within consciousness itself.

§ 13. The Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction and the Transcendental Semblance of Doubling.

The task that now arises is how to make this correlation between constituting subjectivity and constituted objectivity intelligible, not just to prattle about it in empty generality but to clarify it in terms of all the categorial forms of worldliness [*Weltlichkeit*], in accordance with the universal structures of the world itself. If we accept the premise that the constitutive functions of consciousness, [337] both active and passive, are actually to be brought to light, functions which make evident to us the meaning and self-verifying being of a world we accept as there, then this task is manifestly a totally different one from that of all positive sciences – and, as compared with all of them, is completely new. For all of these sciences, the intelligible existence [*Dasein*] of a world is presupposed, and its fundamental knowability, also, to no less a degree. Both of these remain outside the topic [of a transcendental phenomenology]. The all-embracing question for these sciences is how this world, and a world as such, is to be determined in objective truth. The question which already leaps beyond every positivity, namely whether there is a world at all in objective truth, and the critical question of how this is to be established, may not be held before us at the outset, no matter how much the latter question already penetrates into what is primordially transcendental. Rather, the original and in itself chief question, as we mentioned, is directed to a clarifying disclosure of the consciousness that, as such, constitutes all objectivity. And correlatively it is directed to that which emerges in it (and in the whole objectivizing subjectivity) as a result, the world and a possible world as such as a meaning of being [*Seinssinn*] that originates in this way for us.

Like every meaningful question, the transcendental question presupposes a ground of unquestioned being, in which all the means for its resolution must be contained. When we pose this question *to our factual world*,[7] we presuppose our being and our conscious life, understood as that through whose unknown productive functioning this world acquires a meaning for us, as well as all that is determined within the world of these objects of experience, etc. In *eidetic inquiry* we have to do with *a conceivable world* as such in apriori generality, and indeed as related to a freely conceivable modification of our subjectivity, again presupposed as constituting that world. Admittedly, as factual presences in the background we inseparably also play our role, in so far as we are the ones who have conceived the possible worlds of possible constituting subjectivities. It should be evident that this unquestioned and presupposed ontological ground [*Seinsboden*], which is also the basis for the presupposed possibilities, is not to be confused with what the *transcendental*

[7] Translator's note: Emphases in this paragraph have been added by the translator.

question in its generality takes to be in question.

The universal domain of transcendental questionability is the totality of transcendental naïveté which is the whole of the self-evidently existing world as such. Accordingly, this world is put in parentheses with regard to its simple acceptance; it is suspended without asking whether this is justified or not. We do not allow ourselves to make a statement straight-out about anything real [*Reales*]; we may not make use of anything in the realm of what is at hand, no matter how evident it may be. To do so would be absurd – contrary to the meaning of transcendental inquiry. In accordance with it all positive sciences are subjected to an *epoché* called the "transcendental *epoché*." – Along with this, then, it would be a "transcendental circle" to base transcendental philosophy, that is, the science constructed according to the demands of the transcendental question, on psychology, which, to be sure, exists not only as an empirical science but also as an eidetic positive science. Or stated equivalently: The subjectivity which itself constitutes all (real and ideal) objectivity cannot be psychological subjectivity, not even that psychological subjectivity which eidetically and in phenomenological purity is the topic of psychological phenomenology.

But how do we overcome the paradox of our doubling [*Verdoppelung*] – and that of all possible subjects? We are fated as human beings to be the psychophysical subjects of a mental life in the real world and, at the same time, transcendentally to be subjects of a transcendental, world-constituting life-process. To clarify this paradox, consider the following: mental subjectivity, the concretely grasped "I" and "we" of everyday discourse, is grasped experientially in its own essentiality through the method of phenomenological-psychological reduction. Its eidetic variation (in focussing on what is a priori conceivable) creates the basis for pure phenomenological psychology. The subjects, which as "minds" [*Seelen*] are the topic for psychology, are the human subjects we find every day when we are in the natural focus. They are out there before us, and we ourselves as human beings are bodily and mentally present to ourselves through objective external apperception and eventually through topical acts of external perception. We observe that every external perception of individual realities, and thus every moment that is not self-sufficient within us, has its being within a universal external apperception which runs through the whole course of our waking life; [339] it is through this apperception, operating steadily and continuously, that one is aware of a total perceptual present with its horizon of an open past and future; and in the course of this flowing-along one is conscious of this as the changing modes of appearance of the one unceasing spatial world existing from out of living temporality.

If in reflection we focus on this all-embracing apperception of what is external, and next on the total conscious life in which it is grounded, then this

conscious life can be seen as that unitary subjective being and life-process existing in itself, in which being for us – the being there for me of "the" world and all the specific existing realities that are there for me – is made, so to speak. The world – of which we are always speaking, which we can always project in fantasy or imagination – along with everything that is intuitively or logically there for us – is none other than the noematic correlate of this all-embracing subjectivity of consciousness, and the experiential world given through that all-embracing apperception of the external world. Now how do things stand in relation to this subjectivity? Is it [subjectivity] something that I or we as human beings experience? Is it something experienceable? Is it what is before us, available in the world of extension as belonging to the spatial world? We ourselves as human beings are out there, are present to ourselves, individually and collectively, within an all-embracing apperception and yet only present to ourselves by virtue of special external apperceptions. In perceptions *of external things* I myself am given to myself within the total perception of an open spatial world, a perception that extends still further into the all-embracing; thus, in external experience I also experience myself as a human being. It is not merely my outward bodily corporality which is externally perceived; the merely natural body is the object of an abstractive focus; but, as concrete person I am in space; I am given in the spatial world as every other person as such is given, and again as every cultural object, every artwork, etc., is given. In this focus on external experience (in the world of space) my subjectivity and every other mental subjectivity is a component of this concrete being as person and consequently it is the correlate of a certain external apperception within the all-embracing apperception of the world.

It is now evident that the apperceiving conscious life-process, wherein the world and human being in its particularity within it are constituted as existentially real, is not what is [340] apperceived or constituted [in it]; it is not the mental which as human mental being or human mental life-process comprises the apperceptive make-up of the real world. Something [else yet] is necessary in order to make this distinction between transcendental and worldly, concrete conscious life (between transcendental and real subjectivity, respectively), as fully secure as possible, and in order to make transcendental subjectivity evident as an absolutely autonomous field of real and possible experience (thus to be called transcendental), and as a further consequence to secure and make evident an absolute or transcendental science based on it [real and possible experience]. To this end we will treat the "transcendental-phenomenological reduction" a little more precisely, the method of access which leads systematically from the necessarily first given field of experience, that of external experiencing of the world, upward into all-embracing, constitutive absolute being, i.e., – into transcendental subjectivity. In order to make our ascent easier we will not carry out the transcendental reduction directly;

rather, we will proceed stepwise from the psychological [phenomenological] reduction, and treat the transcendental reduction as a further reduction which grows out of and fulfills the psychological reduction. Let us review the type of phenomenological reduction practiced by the psychologist. As a researcher in a positive science, the psychologist has as his object of study mental subjectivity as something real in the pregiven, constantly and naturally accepted world. As eidetic phenomenologist, however, he explores the logos of the mental. His thematic ground is then a conceivable world as such, likewise still thought of as simply existing and pregiven.

The phenomenological-psychological reduction is for him a method of limiting the concretely mental [*das real Seelische*] and above all the intentional process, to its eidetic essence by putting out of play or leaving out of account the transcendent positings at work in this life-process. In order to gain the pure mental totality from the outset in the form of all-embracing and unitary phenomenological intuition, and from there to press on to an eidetic psychology of pure phenomenological subjectivity, that putting-out-of-account, that phenomenological *epoché*, must be carried out beforehand in generality and in a habitual volition. In doing this, however, the psychologist still does not cease to be a positive-science researcher; in other words, [341] to hold his apperception of the world in acceptance as valid. But as soon as he radically inhibits his apperception, a Copernican revolution take place which attacks the whole of his life, including all of his work as a psychologist. He becomes a transcendental phenomenologist who now no longer has "the" world (or even a possible world that he presupposes as existent); he no longer is investigating objects at hand, realities that belong to the world. For him the world and every possible world is *mere phenomenon*. Instead of having the world as pregiven existence, as he as normal human being previously did, he is now merely a transcendental spectator who observes and, in experience and analysis of experience, *uncovers* this having of world, [i.e.,] the way that a world and this world "appears" in consciousness in accordance with meaning and is accepted as real.

While the psychological inner experience conceived purely as phenomenological always still remained a kind of external, worldly experience, after the radical *epoché* with regard to world-acceptance the psychological inner experience became a new kind of transcendental experience in which absolutely nothing from real, spatial-worldly being is straightforwardly posited. While the psychologist as psychologist was from first to last included in the topic in apperceptive form as a person in the world, the phenomenologist as phenomenologist, on the other hand, is for himself no longer I, this particular person; rather, as person he or she is "put in parentheses," is himself/herself a phenomenon. For his transcendental ego, he or she is a phenomenon of egoic being, of egoic life-process [*Ich-Seins and Ich-Lebens*], which in the radical

epoché remains continuously demonstrable as precisely that ultimately functioning subjectivity whose previously hidden accomplishment is the all-embracing apperception of the world.

The transcendental *epoché*, the radical putting out of consideration every practice whatsoever of accepting the "existing world," is accomplished through an act of will in such a way that it is "once and for all"; from now on this habitually and constantly firm resolve of will makes the phenomenologist a transcendental phenomenologist and opens up to him or her the field of transcendental experience and the eidetics of the transcendental.

It is easy to see, now, that the whole of mental content [*seelische Gehalt*] in its proper essence, a content which the psychological-phenomenological reduction brings to light and which psychological phenomenology describes, remains conserved as [342] *transcendental* content through the higher-level and radicalized *epoché*, except that whatever is of psychological-real significance within it is left behind in the phenomenon. This [transcendental] content is constantly broadened to encompass the apperceptive bestowing of meaning as human consciousness, the human mind [or soul], and the like.

If the transcendentally attuned [or focussed] ego, that is, the ego living in the habituality of the radical *epoché*, accomplishes its reflection on consciousness, ever and again repeating such reflection, then there is generated for it the pure transcendental, ever and again the transcendental; indeed, it comes in the manner of a quite new kind of experience which is "inner" in the transcendental sense; or, better, is transcendental experience. And parallel with this, the following also holds true: If the reflection on consciousness is accomplished by someone in the phenomenological-psychological focus, and in iteration, offers reflection on this reflection, and so on, no matter how much the researcher may obtain thereby for the phenomenological, his or her reflection on consciousness will still only attain a psychological meaning.

The transcendental field of being [*Seinsfeld*] as well as the method of access to it, transcendental reduction, are *in parallel* with the phenomenological-psychological field, and to the means of access to it, the psychological reduction. We can also say: the concretely grasped transcendental ego and transcendental community of egos, along with the concretely full transcendental life, are the transcendental parallel to the level of "I" as human being and we as human beings in their ordinary meaning, concretely grasped as purely mental subjects with their purely mental life. *Parallel* in this case means: a correspondence that is parallel in each and every particular and connection; it means a being different and a being separated that is different in a quite peculiar way and yet not with an outsideness from each other in any kind of natural-level sense of the world. This must be correctly understood. My transcendental ego is, as the ego of transcendental experience of self, clearly "different" from my natural human ego, and yet it is anything but some kind of

second something separate from it; it is anything but a doubleness in the natural sense of one being outside the another. Indeed, evidently it only requires an alteration of focus, mediated through the transcendental *epoché*, to transform my purely psychological experience of self (the phenomenological, in a psychological sense) into transcendental experience of self. And corresponding to this, all the things I meet with in my mind acquire through it by the confirmation of their proper essences, a new, absolute transcendental meaning.

§ 14. On the Parallelism between Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Phenomenology.

This transition within transcendental reflection necessarily creates an identification. I, who am in my absolute and ultimate being wholely and completely nothing objective but rather the absolute subject-*ego*, find myself within my life-process, which is constituting all objective being for me, as an acceptance-correlate [*Geltungskorrelat*: that is, the correlative entity within the mental process of accepting things as this or that and as truly existent] in an apperceived form as human ego accepted as an object, that is to say, as the content of a self-objectivation (self-apperception) which, as something produced by me – that is, as a production [*Leistung*] in which I am imposing a concrete meaning on myself – belongs precisely to my absolute being. If this intermingling has become intelligible by means of an alteration of focus – an alteration which, of course, is already taking place within the transcendental focus – and with this the peculiar overlapping of spheres of experience right down to specific details, then the result is self-evident: a remarkable parallelism, indeed, to a certain extent an overlap, of phenomenological psychology and transcendental phenomenology – both understood as eidetic disciplines. The one is implicitly concealed in the other, so to speak. If, while remaining captive to normal positivity we cultivate a consistent psychological phenomenology of all-embracing intersubjectivity, a universal eidetics based on purely mental intuition, then a single volitional step – the willing of a universal and radical *epoché* – will lead to a transcendental transvaluation of all the results of phenomenological psychology. Obviously this requires as motive for it all the considerations that lead to transcendental inquiry. Turning this around: Standing on a firm transcendental foundation [*Boden*] and working out a transcendental science, we certainly can still put ourselves back into the natural focus and give everything that has been transcendentally determined regarding structural forms of a possible transcendental subjectivity the eidetic signification of phenomenological-psychological structures. In this instance,

though, the knowledge remains as a lasting acquisition for transcendental research – a knowledge which remains foreign to the naïvely positive psychologist – that all positivity, and especially psychological positivity, is a noematic formation accomplished by transcendental operations.

I must still mention the fact that, as one can see, eidetic [344] phenomenological psychology is anything but a mere eidetics of the individual *ego*; it is, rather, the eidetics of phenomenological intersubjectivity. With the introduction of the transcendental reduction this intersubjective psychological eidetics finds its transcendental parallel. Concrete, full transcendental subjectivity is the *All* [space, cosmos] that comes from within, pure, transcendentally harmonious and only in this way the concrete cosmos [*All*] of an open community of egos.

Transcendental intersubjectivity is the absolute and only self-sufficient ontological foundation [*Seinsboden*]. Out of it are created the meaning and validity of everything objective, the totality [*All*, cosmos] of objectively real existent entities, but also every ideal world as well. An objectively existent thing is from first to last an existent thing only in a peculiar, relative and incomplete sense. It is an existent thing, so to speak, only on the basis of a cover-up of its transcendental constitution that goes unnoticed in the natural focus [or attitude]. And on account of this cover-up, the fact simply does not become visible that the objective thing is a unity whose intentional unity and acceptance as valid is intentionally constituted, and it has its true being in and for itself only on the basis of a transcendental bestowal of meaning, thus gaining its continuing credibility and persuasiveness from ongoing processes of legitimation within the transcendental and through the habituality arising out of these [processes] in accordance with their essence.

§ 15. Pure Psychology as Propaedeutic for Transcendental Phenomenology. <The Radical Overcoming of Psychologism.>

Through a clarification of the ambiguity of meaning in the nature of (phenomenologically pure) conscious subjectivity and the eidetic science relating to it, we can understand on deepest grounds the historical invincibility of psychologism. Its power lies in a transcendental semblance or illusion [*Schein*], quite in accordance with its essence, which, so long as it remained unnoticed and undisclosed as an illusion, had to continue exercising its influence.

From Descartes' time into our own, the transcendental problem did not penetrate through to clarity and scientific definiteness with regard to its fundamental and necessary principles. Only radical reflection of an unlimited all-

embracingness in which all conceivable existing things belong a priori to the intentional realm of our subjectivity and every subjectivity we could ever conceive of (and whose functions of consciousness produce every meaning of being and every truth), could lead to the genuine transcendental problem [345] and to the radical question of the sense of being [*Seinssinn*] of this subjectivity and the method of grasping it. Only when the transcendental-phenomenological reduction was developed could our knowledge mature to fullness: that the transcendental subjectivity of consciousness (which was presupposed in the problem) is not an empty metaphysical postulate but something given within an experience of its own type, namely transcendental experience, but, to be sure, [this subjectivity is] an infinite realm of manifold special types of experiences and therewith also of an infinite number of descriptions and analyses.

From that point it was a fundamentally important further step to recognize the significance of the transcendental-phenomenological experience: namely, that its sphere is not merely the philosophizer's own transcendentally purified ego but rather, it is what makes itself known in this ego through the manifold alter ego opened by transcendental empathizing and then from the transcendentally open, endless egoic community which manifests itself transcendentally in every ego in changing orientation.

Therewith, a transcendental philosophy as rigorous science[8] resting on the absolute ontological foundation [*Seinsboden*], which is to say the experiential foundation [*Erfahrungsboden*] of transcendental intersubjectivity, instead of on our groundless speculation (namely, resting on no corresponding experience), which is always ready to envelope everything in mythical metaphysics.

The breakdown in conceptualizing transcendental subjectivity in a radical way, or what amounts to the same thing, the absence of the method of transcendental reduction, did not allow a separation to be made between this transcendental subjectivity and psychological subjectivity. One of these is, so to say, the above-the-world, as world-constituting, theme of transcendental philosophy, first and foremost of eidetic transcendental phenomenology; the other is internal to the world as the empirical topic [*Thema*] of psychology, as the eidetic theme of phenomenological psychology. So the psychology of cognition [*Erkenntnis*, knowledge] had to be transformed unnoticed into the transcendental theory of knowing [or epistemology], and the psychology of the valuing and practical reason had to be transformed into the transcendental theory [346] of these sorts of reason [*Vernunftsarten*]. Psychologism thus had to remain unclarified and in force – I mean the fundamental [*prinzipielle*],

[8] Rigorous science – of course, this concept is transformed through the whole undertaking by phenomenology of the reduction. The will to ultimate responsibility, in which the universe of possible knowledge is to arise, leads to a recognition of the fundamental insufficiency of all "rigorous science" in the positivist sense, etc.

transcendental psychologism, which is lethal to the possibility of a scientific philosophy, and yet is totally unscathed by refutations of the psychologism in pure apophantic logic or of parallel psychologisms in formal axiology and [theory of] practice [*Praktik*].

To be sure, there was no lack of argumentative antipsychologism in traditional transcendental philosophy, but nowhere were the objections deeply and firmly enough based, nor did those who explored the evidence see conceptually that a science of the transcendental must self-evidently go back to conscious experience [*Bewusstseinserfahrung*] and on this ground [*Boden*] through actual descriptive, analytic and eidetic work, carry out a radical clarification of all of reason in its special forms. This path, had it been pursued with radical consistency, would have led to the development of a pure eidetic phenomenology. Even before the necessity for a fundamental separation between psychological and transcendental phenomenology (and, within this, a phenomenological theory of reason) had been recognized, such an eidetic phenomenology would have at least implicitly accomplished the main work, although the truly definitive solution could only come about after this separation. In contrast to this possibility, the foes of psychologism, because they were tricked by anxiety over the potential psychologism of systematic and universal research into consciousness and pushed it away to the psychologists, fell into pointless formalistic argumentation and distinguishing among concepts; this was contrary to the spirit of genuine science and could bear little fruit.

A definitive clarification of the real meaning of transcendental philosophy, as well as of transcendental psychologism and the definitive overcoming of it, only became possible through developing the idea of an eidetic phenomenology as something double, and through radical meditations appertaining to it of the sort we have presented above.

§ 16. The Building of a Transcendental Philosophy.

This makes understandable a certain independence from psychological phenomenology in the construction of a transcendental phenomenology, and vice versa, in spite of their being fundamentally intertwined and interimplicated with one another and therewith, conceived in their fulfillment with full self-understanding of their meaning, and their identicalness. 1) It is already clear at the outset that without linking up with psychology at all (much less with any other science) one can at once take into consideration the relatedness of all objectivity to consciousness, formulate the transcendental problem, proceed to the transcendental reduction and through it to transcendental expe-

rience and eidetic research – and thus bring a transcendental phenomenology directly into being. In fact, this is the course I attempted to pursue in my *Ideas*. 2) On the other hand, one can, as our presentation in these lectures has shown, start out at first undisturbed by any transcendental-philosophical interests, from the question of the requirements for a rigorously scientific psychology as positive science: one can demonstrate the necessity for a methodically foundational and purely rational (eidetic) discipline focussed on what belongs to the very essence of the mental and on the all-embracingness of a purely mental context, and in this way systematically develop the idea of an eidetic phenomenological psychology, having it establish itself in the full all-embracingness of a phenomenology of intersubjectivity. Afterwards, the peculiar nature of the necessary phenomenological *epoché* as "parenthesizing" the whole world, even though an acceptance of the natural world as existent certainly lies at its foundation, immediately offers an obvious motive for radicalizing this reduction, for awakening the transcendental problem in its purest form, and producing, like the Copernican revolution, a transcendental revolution in psychological phenomenology. This indirect path through the positivity of empirical and eidetic psychology has great propaedeutic advantages:

a. The transcendental focus which is set up through a radically consistent and conscious transcendental reduction, signifies nothing less than an [348] altering of the whole form of life [*Lebensform*] previously practiced not only by the particular "I" and "we" but also historically by humanity as a whole: an absolute, all-embracing, and radical shift in the natural living-along of life and one's natural living in a pregiven world; a change in the mode of experiencing, of thinking, and of every other kind of activity, and also in all the modes of reason. The radical undergirding of this sort of life and work and attunement of all of life on the foundation of transcendental experience must by virtue of its absolute alienness from everything to which we have been accustomed, be, like anything new, very hard to understand. And likewise with the meaning of a purely transcendental science.

b. On the other hand, psychological phenomenology is certainly also a new thing historically in its method of intentional analysis, and especially in its disclosure of intentional implications, completely original. And since it moves within the natural focus, it still possesses the accessibility of all positive science. Once it is clear and distinct with regard to its idea and at least some basic steps have been taken for carrying it out, then it will only take a little deeper-level reflection in order to make the transcendental problematic palpable and clear by means of it and then to turn the phenomenological reduction around and thus accomplish the transformation of the essential content of phenomenological psychology into a pure transcendental [philosophy].

One may distinguish two fundamental difficulties in pressing on into the

new phenomenology and arrange them on the two levels mentioned above: first, the difficulty in understanding the genuine method of [attaining] a pure "inner experience," which already belongs to making a psychological phenomenology and a psychology as rational science of facts possible; and secondly, the difficulty in understanding a transcendental questioning standpoint and method which goes beyond all positivity.[9]

The transcendental interest, taken in itself, is certainly [349] the highest and ultimate scientific interest; so much so, that transcendental phenomenology is not only a philosophical discipline in a specialized sense and a philosophical foundational science, but also is the all-embracing absolute science which enables every possible science to be an ultimately scientific science. In its systematic development it leads to all eidetic sciences, through which then all factual sciences are rationalized, but at the same time, when transcendentally established, they are so broadened as to leave no more meaningful problems open – say, under the heading of philosophical problems that got left out. Accordingly, in a system of sciences, or better, in the construction of a universal science in which each individual science is not a separated and isolated piece but rather a living branch of the universal [all-encompassing] science, the right way to go is first to formulate transcendental phenomenology independently in its transcendental theories, and next show what it is in itself by exhibiting the essential nature of the natural focus as over against the essential nature of the transcendental focus, and through this bring to light the possibility of making a conversion of the transcendental phenomenological doctrines into doctrines of psychological positivity.[10]

---

[9] Historically, transcendental phenomenology developed in such a way that eidetic phenomenology presented itself first, which in its novelty saw the historical psychology as something set in opposition to it. From the beginning it [transcendental philosophy] thought of itself as the basic [*Grund*] science dedicated to transcendental clarification, but certainly at that point without clarity about its genuine meaning, even without the most radical grasp of the transcendental problem; thus, still in transcendental ambiguity [or doubleness of meaning, *Doppeldeutigkeit*].

[10] (Overview of the Planned Third Part:)

Part III. Transcendental Phenomenology:
Philosophy as Universal Science Established on an Absolute Ground

§ 17. Transcendental Phenomenology as Ontology.
§ 18. Phenomenology and the Crisis of Foundations in the Exact Sciences.
§ 19. The Phenomenological Grounding of the Factual Sciences and the Empirical Sciences.
§ 20. Complete Phenomenology and Universal Philosophy.
§ 21. The Highest and Ultimate Problems as Phenomenological.
§ 22. The Phenomenological Resolution of All Philosophical Anthitheses.

PART THREE

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS ON HEIDEGGER'S WORKS

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER, *BEING AND TIME*

Newly edited from the original notes and translated by Thomas Sheehan

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

Thomas Sheehan

Sein und Zeit (hereinafter: *SZ*) was published in April of 1927 both in the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, vol. VIII, and in a separate printing ("Sonderdruck").[1] The indications and comments translated below were made by Edmund Husserl in his "Sonderdruck" copy of the work between the spring of 1927 and the fall of 1929.

Husserl's copious notes in the margins of *SZ* include not only written comments but also such marks as underlinings, exclamations points, question marks, vertical, slanted, and wavy lines, and the abbreviation "N.B." In this edition underlinings or marks of emphasis are not noted, unless Husserl accompanies them with a remark or they are judged to be particularly significant. Unless otherwise indicated, Husserl's notes are written in shorthand, except for "N.B.," which is always written in cursive. Most of Husserl's comments and notations were made in ordinary lead pencil, but some were done in blue- and green-colored lead pencil.

I base this English edition on a close examination of Husserl's personal copy of *SZ* (I have used both the original text and a photocopy of it), as well as on various manuscript versions of Husserl's marginalia prepared by researchers in the Husserl-Archives at Leuven. I have also referred to the published version edited by Roland Breeur.[2] As regards page-and-line references, the judgments underlying the present text sometimes diverge from those of Dr. Breeur and therefore from the French edition that is based on Breeur's and

---

[1] *Sein und Zeit*, Erste Hälfte, Sonderdruck aus *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, Band VII [sic], Halle a.d. Saale, Niemeyer 1927 (format: 23 x 17 cm.), pp. xii + 438; also in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, vol. VIII, pages v–ix + 1–438. In English: (1) Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, New York/ Evanston: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962, and (2) Martin Heidegger: *Being and Time: A Translation of Sein und Zeit*, translated by Joan Stambaugh, Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1996. Hereinafter the German and English editions are abbreviated as, respectively, *SZ* and *BT*. *SZ-1* (i.e., *SZ*, first edition) refers to the Sonderdruck edition, *SZ-15* refers to the fifteenth edition. *BT-1* refers to the Macquarrie-Robinson translation, whereas *BT-2* refers to the Stambaugh translation.

[2] Roland Breeur, "Randbemerkungen Husserls zu Heideggers *Sein und Zeit* und *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*," in *Husserl Studies* 11 (1994), 3–63; for *SZ*: pp. 9–48.

S. Spileers' work,[3] as well as from other editions. I assume responsibility for those divergences and welcome any improvements to the present version.

The following typical entry can illustrate how this edition is laid out.

1.	**15.36–37 15.34–35 36.29–32 14.5–8**
2.	*Text in SZ*: "Rather, in keeping with a kind of being that belongs to it, Dasein has the tendency to understand its own being in terms of *that* entity to which, for essential reasons, it relates directly and constantly: the 'world.' "
3.	*Husserl underlines*: "tendency to understand its own being in terms of *that* entity"
4.	*In the right margin*: How is that to be proven?

Each reference in this edition provides, under the appropriate rubric, all or some of the following:

1. PAGE AND LINE REFERENCES:

Four page references. The four numbers (in this example: 15.36–37, 15.34–35, 36.29–32, and 14.5–8) indicate the page and line/s in Heidegger's text to which Husserl's comments and notations refer. The four numbers, moving from left to right, indicate respectively:

- the German text of *SZ* in the relatively inaccessible first edition that Husserl used and marked up (the 1927 Sonderdruck, hereinafter abbreviated as *SZ-1*);
- the German text of *SZ* in the readily available fifteenth edition (1979; hereinafter abbreviated as *SZ-15*);[4]
- the English translation by Macquarrie and Robinson (1962, hereinafter abbreviated as *BT-1*);
- the English translation by Stambaugh (1996, hereinafter abbreviated as *BT-2*).

---

[3] Edmund Husserl, *Notes sur Heidegger*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1993: "Notes marginales de Husserl à *Etre et temps*," trans. Natalie Depraz, pp. 9–38.

[4] The pagination of *SZ-1* accords generally with that of *SZ-15*. The two differ by no more than (and usually less than) five lines. The exception: *SZ-1* p. 438.8 = the last line of *SZ-15* p. 437.

The lines that are referenced. Note that the page-and-line numbers refer to the specific words or lines in *SZ* that Husserl comments on (with the surrounding text), *not* to the space taken up in the margin by Husserl's remark. The reader is forewarned that the relation between Husserl's marginal notes and Heidegger's own text is not always clear and that the connections made in this text (and in other editions) are sometimes a matter of guesswork. Whereas consultation of the original book and marginalia is imperative in adjudicating such matters, such consultation may not resolve all questions. Moreover, the line numbers are sometimes approximations.

Counting the lines: The counting of the lines on the pages, both in the German editions of *SZ* and in *BT*, follows these rules:

- The line-count does *not* include the "header" either in *SZ* or *BT*, that is, the line at the top of the page containing the page number, the name of the author, the title of the book, and the like.[5] The count begins, rather, with the first line of text on the page after the "header."
- The line-count *does* account for any footnote material at the bottom of the page.
- The count also includes the line or lines on which appear any division-, chapter-, or section-titles, including single lines with only numbers on them. (An example of the latter is *BT-1*, p. 67: The Roman numeral "I" at the top of the page is calculated as falling on line one, that is: 67.1.)
- Empty lines are not counted.

2. THE TEXT IN *SZ*

The entry supplies an English translation of the text in *SZ* (often with the surrounding text) to which Husserl is referring. Heidegger's text is always placed within quotation marks.[6] In most cases I provide my own translation of these texts, rather than using the translations of either Macquarrie and Robinson or Stambaugh. (Some of the terminological differences between my translations and those of *BT-1* and *BT-2* are noted at the end of this introduction.

[5] *BT-1*, *BT-2*, and *SZ-1* have such a "header," but *SZ-15* does not.

[6] The "Errata List" is translated as it appears in *SZ-1*, but only the text changes appear within quotation marks.

3. HUSSERL'S UNDERLININGS

When adjudged significant, underlinings that Husserl makes within Heidegger's text are noted. Such underlined text is always placed within quotation marks. The sign of an ellipsis [...] indicates that Husserl's underlining does not take in the words indicated by the ellipsis.

4. HUSSERL'S COMMENTS

The editor's phrases "In the left margin," "In the right margin," and "In the top [or bottom] margin" refer to the margins in *SZ-1*, not in *SZ-15*. Any words that appear in square brackets ([...]) within Husserl's or Heidegger's texts were added by the editor. Besides his written remarks, Husserl's exclamation points, question marks, and "N.B." are duly noted.

SOME TRANSLATIONS USED IN THIS EDITION

Aufenthalt: (only at *SZ-15* 61.40): hanging around
Auslegung, auslegend: explication, explicating
Befindlichkeit: disposition
bezeugen: to testify, to evidence
Da: 'openness,' the 'open'
das Man: Everyone
das Sein: being (lower case)
das Seiende: entity
eigen, eigenst: own, ownmost
Ent-fernung: re-moving
entdecken: discover
Entschlossenheit: resolution
Erstreckung: extension, extending
freischwebend: ungrounded
Fürsorge: concern-for-others
Geschehen: being-historical
Geschichtlichkeit: historicity
gespannt (*SZ-15* 423.30–31): stretched out
gewesen, Gewesenheit: already, alreadiness
In-der-Welt-sein: being-in-a-world
innerweltlich: within-a-world
Mensch: human being

Miteinandersein: being-with-each-other
nächst: most immediate
Nichtigkeit: not-ness
Rede: discursiveness, discourse
Seinkönnen: ability-to-be
Spielraum: lived space
Überlieferung: freeing-up, liberating*
Umsicht: practical insight
umsichtlich: practical, practically, with practical insight
Umwelt: lived world
verweilen: to hang around
vorhanden: just-there
Vorhandenheit, Vorhandensein: thereness, just-there-ness
Zeug: implement
zuhanden: useful, (rarely [e.g., *SZ-15* 80.20]) available
Zuhandenheit, Zuhandensein: usefulness
Zukunft: becoming
zunächst und zumeist (when used as a stock phrase): usually and generally

* See Martin Heidegger, *Was ist das – die Philosophie?* Pfullingen: Neske, 1956, pp. 8 and 21.

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER, *BEING AND TIME*

newly edited from the original notes
and translated by
Thomas Sheehan

FRONT MATTER

The cover and opening pages of *SZ-1*

The inside of the bookcover of *SZ-1*, as well as the very first pages before the full title page, contain important remarks and materials. We first give an outline of the front material in *SZ-1*, and then go into the details of what they contain.

(English name)	(German name)
FRONT MATTER	
The book cover of *SZ-1*	Umschlag
Inside of front bookcover (front endpaper)	Inneseite des Umschlages
The first inner page (or: flyleaf) recto verso	innere Umschlagblatt Vorderseite Rückseite
Half-title page recto verso	Erstes Titelblatt [Schmutztitel] Vorderseite p. i Rückseite p. ii
Title page recto verso	Haupttitelblatt Vorderseite p. iii Rückseite p. iv
Dedication and printing information recto: dedication verso: printing information	Widmungsblatt Vorderseite p. v Rückseite p. vi
Table of Contents	Inhalt pp. vii–xi
TEXT	
Sein und Zeit, first page Text from the *Sophist* Two opening paragraphs	*Sein und Zeit* p. 1 Text from the *Sophist* Two opening paragraphs
etc.	etc.

The inside of the bookcover (front endpaper)[1]

[*Husserl's remarks:*]

Born 26.IX[1]

Critical:[2] ungrounded classifying, staring, etc.
271[3] and 273,[4] 274,[5] 278,[6] 286 (value),[7] 294[8]

[*After some space:*[9]]

306,[10] 314, 323, 387

[*After some space:*]

mathematical project of nature (mathematical natural science) 362[11]

thematizing 363[12] significance 87[13]

thrownness 383[14]

fate 384[15]

[1] The notes immediately follow this page.

1. Martin Heidegger was born in Messkirch, Baden, on September 26, 1889.
2. By "Critical" [*Kritisches*; the word appears in cursive] Husserl means texts in *SZ* that he takes to be critical of others, perhaps also of himself. The fifteen page numbers that follow are reproduced as Husserl wrote them in his own copy of the book. They correspond to *SZ-1*. The corresponding pages in *SZ-15*, as well as in *BT-1* and *BT-2* are provided in the footnotes that immediately follow.
3. This page number is keyed to Husserl's phrase "ungrounded classifying" in the preceding line, and it refers ahead to: *SZ-1* 271.38–272.2 = *SZ-15* 271.38–272.3 = *BT-1* 317.7–9 = *BT-2* 251.26–29, specifically to: "any ungrounded framework of classified mental faculties or personal acts." Some of the objects of Heidegger's criticism are listed in his footnote at that text.
4. This page number is keyed to Husserl's word "staring" in the previous line, and it refers ahead to: *SZ-1* 273.12–16 = *SZ-15* 273.15–19 = *BT-1* 318.1–5 = *BT-2* 252.22–26, specifically to: "...the self that is found by 'analytically' staring at one's mental states and what lies behind them." Husserl's first remark on "staring" is at *SZ-1* 74.9–12 = *SZ-15* 74.7–10 = *BT-1* 104.5–9 = *BT-2* 69.21–24.
5. It is not clear what this page number refers to. The only mark on p. 274 of Husserl's copy of *SZ* is a short dash in the left margin at: *SZ-1* 274, ca. line 12 = *SZ-15* 274, ca. lines 13–14 = *BT-1* 319, ca. line 1 = *BT-2* 253 ca. line 15, that is, near the text: "...the call [of conscience] gets *heard* in such a way that instead of becoming authentically understood, it gets drawn by the Everyone-self into a debate-like soliloquy and gets perverted in its tendency to disclose."
6. This refers to *SZ-1* 278.10–14 = *SZ-15* 278.10–14 = *BT-1* 323.10–13 = *BT-2* 256.34–38 where Heidegger criticizes any analysis in which Dasein's being is *under*estimated, i.e., taken "as a harmless subject, endowed with personal consciousness, which somehow or other happens to occur." Husserl marks the passage with "!! N.B."
7. See *SZ-1* 286.20 = *SZ-15* 286.19 = *BT-1* 332.17 = *BT-2* 264.2: "the idea of 'value.' "
8. Below at *SZ-1* 294.14–16 = *SZ-15* 294.12–15 = *BT-1* 340.28–31 = *BT-2* 271.10–13 Heidegger criticizes Scheler's demand for a "material ethics of value" as contrasted with a merely formal one, by suggesting it is based in part on "commonsense concern, which forces Dasein's eksistence to fit the notion of a rule-bound business procedure."
9. It seems that the following four page numbers, unlike the previous six, do not refer to perceived "criticisms" of Husserl and others by Heidegger; but it is not readily clear exactly what they refer to.
10. Presumably this refers to *SZ* 306, note 1 (where Heidegger discusses the possibility of sin), next to which Husserl writes: "N.B. ?."
11. For Heidegger's reference to the mathematical project of nature, see *SZ-1* 362.21–22 = *SZ-15* 362.22–23 = *BT-1* 413.41–414.1 = *BT-2* 331.32–33.
12. Husserl notes Heidegger's word "thematizing" at *SZ-1* 363.10 = *SZ-15* 363.10 = *BT-1* 414.32 = *BT-2* 332.16 and makes an extended remark on it at the bottom of *SZ-1* 363; see *SZ-1* 363.19–21 = *SZ-15* 363.19–22 = *BT-1* 415.2–4 = *BT-2* 332.25–27.
13. See below: *SZ-1* 87.17–18 = *SZ-15* 87.17–18, = *BT-1* 120.23 = *BT-2* 81.31–32.

14. See below, *SZ-1* 383.21 = *SZ-15* 383.20 = *BT-1* 435.4 = *BT-2* 351.4.
15. See below, *SZ-1* 384.11 = *SZ-15* 384.11 = *BT-1* 435.33 = *BT-2* 351.29. The word *Schicksal* ("fate") appears in cursive.

The first inner page (flyleaf) / innere Umschlagblatt

A. Recto / Vorderseite

[*In the upper left-hand corner:*]
BP 78

[*At the top-middle of the page, signed in ink:*]
Edmund Husserl

[*In the upper right-hand corner, Husserl's catalogue number:*]
D-7[2]

[*In the middle of the flyleaf, in Heidegger's hand in cursive, in ink:*]

"For me the greatest clarity was always the greatest beauty."[3]
Lessing.

April 8, 1927.[4]
M. Heidegger.

[2] This is the catalogue indication that Husserl gave the work for location in his own personal library.

[3] "*Die grösste Deutlichkeit war mir immer die grösste Schönheit.*"

[4] This date may, or may not, tell us when Heidegger presented the volume to Husserl. From March 2 until April 19, 1927, Heidegger spent the academic holiday at his cabin at Todtnauberg, in the Black Forest. He may have visited Husserl in Freiburg for his sixty-eighth birthday, which fell on Friday, April 8, 1927, and, if so, it is possible he gave Husserl the copy of *SZ-1*, with the inscription, on that date. (See Heidegger/Jaspers *Briefwechsel*, p. 74, no. 41, and p. 76, no. 43; also Heidegger/Blochmann, *Briefwechsel*, p. 19, no. 13; Husserl, *Briefwechsel*, IV, p. 140).

The first inner page (flyleaf) / innere Umschlagblatt, continued

B. Verso / Rückseite

[A smaller page (21 × 16 cm) is glued to the reverse side of the flyleaf. On it Heidegger has written in ink:[5]*]*

Being and Time[6]
by
M. Heidegger (Marburg a. L.)
...δῆλον γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς μὲν ταῦτα (τί ποτε βούλεσθε σημαίνειν ὁπόταν ὂν φθέγγησθε[7]) πάλαι γιγνώσκετε, ἡμεῖς δὲ πρὸ τοῦ μὲν ᾠόμεθα, νῦν δ' ἠπορήκαμεν.

"...for clearly you have long understood what you mean when you use the word 'being,' whereas we used to think we knew, but now we are at a loss." *Plato*, Sophist 244a[8]

To Edmund Husserl
in grateful respect and friendship.

Todtnauberg in the Black Forest, April 8, 1926.

---

[5] This smaller piece of paper that Husserl glued into *SZ-1* at this point is the very page that Heidegger presented to Husserl in Todtnauberg on Husserl's sixty-seventh birthday, Thursday, April 8, 1926. See *Briefwechsel* III, p. 230 (April 16, 1926, Malvine Husserl to Ingarden).

[6] This title is underscored twice.

[7] This phrase, taken from the previous sentence in the dialogue, is inserted here by Heidegger within parentheses.

[8] Heidegger's German translation here, which dates to April 1926, differs slightly from the one he published a year later in *SZ-1*, p. 1:

1926: "...denn offenbar versteht ihr doch schon lange, was ihr damit meint, wenn ihr das Wort 'seiend' gebraucht, wir aber glaubten es vorher zwar zu wissen, jetzt aber stehen wir ratlos."

1927: "...Denn offenbar seid ihr doch schon lange mit dem vertraut, was ihr eigentlich meint, wenn ihr den Ausdruck 'seiend' gebraucht, wir jedoch glaubten es einst zwar zu verstehen, jetzt aber sind wir in Verlegenheit gekommen."

For other translations by Heidegger see his *Platon: Sophistes*, GA 19, edited by Ingeborg Schüßler, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1992, p. 446–447; and his Heidegger, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, GA 20, p. 179; *History of the Concept of Time*, p. 129.

Half-title page / Erstes Titelblatt [Schmutztitel]

A. Recto / Vorderseite (p. i)[9]

[*The half-title page reads: "Sein und Zeit / Erste Hälfte." Under that Husserl writes in cursive:*]

amicus Plato magis amica
veritas[10]

B. Verso / Rückseite (p. ii)

[*This side is blank.*]

---

[9] This half-title page is found in *SZ-1*, but not in *SZ-15*. *BT-1* has a half-title page (the unnumbered page 1) with only one line: "BEING AND TIME."

[10] ("Plato is a friend, truth a greater friend.") The Latin phrase (spoken as if by Aristotle) condenses the statement in *Nicomachean Ethics* (A, 6, 1096 a 14–17): "Perhaps it would seem to be better – and, what is more, a duty – to destroy even what is closest to us for the sake of saving the truth, especially since we are lovers-of-wisdom; for while both are dear to us, it is a matter of divine ordinance to prefer the truth." However, the provenance of the Latin phrase is complex:

[A] The Platonic dictum: The anonymous *Liber de vita et genere Aristotilis* records a similar statement allegedly made by Plato about Socrates: "et alibi dicit [Plato] 'Amicus quidem Socrates, sed magis amica veritas.'" (In Ingemar Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*, Studia Graeca et Latina Gothburgensia, vol. 5, Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet, 1957, p. 154 [28].) The *Liber de vita* itself is a late twelfth-century translation of one of the many Greek lives of Aristotle (γένος ἀριστοτέλους) in circulation at that time, not unlike, for example, the Greek *Vita vulgata* (cf. its φίλος μὲν Σωκράτης, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον φιλάτη ἡ ἀλήθεια, Düring, p. 132 [9]; cf. also the Greek *Vita marciana*, (*ibid.*, pp. 101–102 [28]).

[B] The Aristotelian dictum: Thomas Aquinas repeated the Platonic dictum of the *Liber de vita* (as above) in his commentary on the above passage from *Nicomachean Ethics* (*In decem libros ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum expositio*, ed. Raimondo M. Spiazzi, Turin and Rome: Marietti, 1949, lectio VI, no. 78, p. 21). Sometime thereafter the Latin of the Platonic dictum was changed into the Latin of the Aristotelian dictum that Husserl inscribed in his copy of *SZ*.

Title page / Haupttitelblatt

A. Recto / Vorderseite (p. iii)[11]

[*In the upper left-hand corner, Husserl's cataloguing mark again:*]

D-7

[*The title page contains a misprint.*]

"Band VII" *should read* "Band VIII."

In the lower right corner, there is a stamp, with the "No." left blank:]

"EX LIBRIS
- Edmund HUSSERL
--No.....

B. Verso / Rückseite (p. iv)

[*No marks by Husserl.*]

[11] Printed on the full-title page of *SZ-1* is: *Sein und Zeit* / von Martin Heidegger / Marburg a. L. / Erste Hälfte /Sonderdruck aus: "Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung", Band VII [sic] / herausgegeben von E. Husserl -- Freiburg i. B. / Max Niemeyer, Verlag, Halle a. d. S. 1927.

Dedication page / Widmungsblatt, and Printing-Information page

A. Recto / Vorderseite: Dedication page / Widmungsblatt (p. v)

[*Printed dedication to Husserl:*[12]]

Dedicated to

Edmund Husserl

in respect and friendship.

Todtnauberg in the Black Forest, Baden April 8, 1926

B. Verso / Rückseite: Printing-Information page (p. vi):

[*"Buchdruckerei des Waisenhauses in Halle (Salle)."*[13] *No marks by Husserl.*]

[12] This printed dedication – which keeps the date of April 8, *1926* – drops the words "*dankbarer*" (as well as the title and the citation from the *Sophist*) from the original handwritten dedication of 1926, and adds the word "Baden" (here, as an adjective: "*bad.*") and "*zugeeignet*''.

[13] "Orphanage Printing Firm, Halle (Salle)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

viii.39 **viii.38** **9.7** **ix.17**

Text in SZ:

[section title:] "§32. Understanding and Explication"

In the left margin, in cursive:

meaning [*Sinn*]

Immediately to the right of the section title:

fore-having, fore-sight, fore-conception[14]

x.28 **x.25** **11.15** **xi.15**

Text in SZ:

[section title:] "§64. Care and selfhood"

Immediately to the right of the section title, in cursive:

I, "I think" (Kant)

x.37 **x.35** **11.25** **xi.25**

Text in SZ:

[section title:] "§68 (a) The temporality of understanding"

In the left margin [partially in cursive]:

concept of understanding

[14] The first two words appear in cursive, the last in shorthand.

ERRATA LIST

SZ-1 p. xi, provides a list of eight errata ["Sinnstörende Druckfehler"]. Although neither BT-1 nor BT-2 reproduces the list, BT-1 duly notes each erratum in a footnote at the respective place in the English translation – except for one (see below). The bracketed interpolations below give page-and-line references to, respectively, SZ-1, SZ-15, BT-1, and BT-2.

xi.31–39

Page 15, line 6 from the bottom:
[15.34–35 = 15.32 = 36.28 = 14.4–5]
"*Besinnung*" instead of "*Bestimmung*."

„ 48, line 17 from the bottom:
[48.23 = 48.23 = 74.5 = 45.15]
"*errechnet*" instead of "*verrechnet*."

„ 53, line 7 from the bottom:
[53.35 = 53.33 = 79.11 = 50.16]
"*des Daseins*" instead of "*des Wesens*."

„ 103, line 3 from the bottom:
[103.39 = 103.38 = 137.19 = 96.23]
"*jede*" instead of "*je*."

„ 111, line 9 from the top:
[111.9 = 111.10 = 145.36 = 103.14]
"*vorfindlich*" instead of "*erfindlich*"

„ 117, line 1 from the top:
[117.1 = 117.3 = 152.32[15] = 110.16]
"*solcher*" instead of "*solche*."

„ 140, line 8 from the top:
[140.40 = 140.8 = 179.10 = 131.30]
"40" instead of "39."

„ 167, line 19 from the top:
[167.19 = 167.19 = 210.33 = 156.33]
"*von ihr aus das...*"[16]

---

[15] This is the only one of these *errata* whose correction is not remarked in a footnote in *BT-1*.
[16] That is to say: the word "*aus*" had been omitted and was to be supplied.

TEXT

INTRODUCTION
EXPOSITION OF THE QUESTION OF THE MEANING OF BEING

CHAPTER ONE
Necessity, Structure, and Priority of the Question of Being

§ 1
The Necessity of an Explicit Retrieval of the Question of Being

2.11–14 **2.12–13** **21.12–14** **1.13–14**

Text in SZ:

"[The question of being] provided a stimulus for the investigations of Plato and Aristotle, only to subside from then on *as a theme for actual research.*"

Husserl underlines:

"to subside from then on"

In the left margin:

And phenomenology?

3.1–38 **3.9–37** **22.12–23.5** **2.12–36**

Husserl's next two notes are found one after the other (but separated) in the bottom margin of SZ-1 p. 3. The paragraph which these notes follow and to which they refer (SZ-1 3.1–38 = SZ-15 3.9–37 = BT-1 22.12–23.5 =BT-2 2.12–36) discusses the fact that, whereas being is the most universal, its universality transcends that of genus and has, rather, the unity of analogy. In that aforementioned paragraph, Husserl underlines two words:

3.18–20 **3.17–18** **22.20–21** **2.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"In the characterization of medieval ontology, 'being' is a '*transcendens*.' "

Husserl underlines:

" '*transcendens*' "

3.20–22 **3.18–21** **22.21–23** **2.21–23**

Text in SZ:

"Aristotle already recognizes the unity of this transcendental 'universal,' which stands in contrast to the multiplicity of the highest generic concepts applicable to things, as the *unity of analogy*."

Husserl underlines:

"*analogy*"

Notes at the bottom of *SZ-1* 3:

Husserl's first note:

Does the heterogenous have an analogy with the heterogenous?

Husserl's second note:

All entities have in common with all [other] entities that without which entities as such are not thinkable, and that is the formal ontological. The logical categories are the formal modes of entities as such; every individual concrete entity is in being [*ist seiend*] as a concretion of these forms.

§ 2
The Formal Structure of the Question of Being

5.36–37 **5.35–36** **25.13–15** **4.23–25**

Text in SZ:

"We do not even know the horizon in terms of which we are supposed to grasp and fix the meaning [of being]. *But this average and vague understanding of being is still a fact.*"

Husserl underlines:

"average and vague"

In the right margin:

?

6.26–29 **6.26–29** **26.8–11** **5.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"Accordingly, *what we are asking about* – the meaning of being – also requires its own conceptuality, which is essentially different from the concepts that determine the meaning of entities."

Husserl underlines:

"its own conceptuality"

In the left margin:

in formal generality, the formal-logical conceptuality

7.1–3 7.1–3 26.23–25 5.21–23

Text in SZ:

"Being consists in: the *fact that* something is; *how* something is; reality; thereness; subsistence; validity; Dasein; the 'there is.' "

In the left margin:

Are these, too, "modes of being"?

7.5–7 7.5–8 26.26–29 5.25–27

Text in SZ:

"Is the starting point optional, or does some particular entity have priority when we come to work out the question of being?"

Husserl underlines:

"priority"

In the right margin:

In an eidetically universal question, can an instance have priority? Is that not precisely excluded?

7.15–26 7.15–27 26.36–27.9 5.35–6.9

In the left margin Husserl puts a bracket next to the following sentences. His next four notes border on and/or refer to it.

Text in SZ:

"Looking at, understanding, conceptualizing, choosing, getting access to – these are constitutive comportments of questioning and thus are modes of being of a particular entity, the entity that we ourselves, the questioners, always are. Therefore, working out the question of being means: clarifying an entity – the questioner – in his or her being. Asking this question is a certain entity's very mode of *being*, and it is determined by what it asks about: being. This entity that we ourselves always are and that, among other things, has questioning as a possibility of being, we term "*Dasein*." Asking the question about the meaning of being in an explicit and clear fashion requires a prior, adequate explanation of an entity (Dasein) with regard to its being."

Husserl's first note:

In the left margin, referring to the entire passage, in cursive:

Questioning as a mode of being

Husserl's second note:

In the right margin, next to the first sentence above:

N.B.

Husserl's third note:

In the right margin, next to "Dasein," In cursive:

Dasein

Husserl's fourth note:

In the bottom margin, SZ-1 7:

Dasein's modes of being – its modes of comportment? But this "Dasein," which is in being [*dieses seiende "Dasein"*], has modes of comportment as its what-determinations, just like nature's "modes of comportment" – its modes of comporting itself in movement and rest [and], under certain circumstances, in combination and fragmentation; its modes of exercising and experiencing causality, properties that are determinations of nature.

7.27–30 **7.28–31** **27.10–12** **6.10–13**

Text in SZ:

"But does not such an undertaking devolve into an obvious circle? To need to define an entity beforehand *in its being*, and then, on that basis, to seek to pose the question about being for the first time – what is this if not going in a circle?"

In the right margin, in cursive:

circle

8.7–11 **8.7–10** **27.27–28.3** **6.29–32**

Text in SZ:

"This guiding activity of taking-a-look at being arises from the average understanding of being in which we always already operate and *which in the end belongs to the essential structure of Dasein itself.*"

Husserl underlines:

"taking-a-look" and "average understanding of being"

In the left margin:

That is obvious, but the taking-a-look does not belong to the entity as its determination.

§ 3
The Ontological Priority of the Question of Being

9.3–6 **9.3–6** **29.10–12** **7.23–26**

Text in SZ:

"Does [the question of being] simply remain (or *is* it at all) merely a matter of soaring speculation about the most general of generalities – *or it is, at one and the same time, the most basic and most concrete question?*"

Husserl underlines:

"*most concrete*"

In the right margin:

Yes, as a transcendental-phenomenological question about the constitutive meaning of being

10.17–11.2 10.18–11.3 30.22–31.12 8.36–9.17

Husserl's next four notes all refer to the paragraph in SZ that runs (in the Macquarrie-Robinson translation) from "Basic concepts determine the way in which we get an understanding beforehand of the subject-matter..." to "His transcendental logic is an a priori *logic for the subject-matter of that area of being called 'Nature.' "*

Husserl's first note:

10.17–22 10.18–23 30.22–27 8.36–41

Text in SZ:

"Basic concepts are the determinations that give the subject-area underlying all thematic objects of a science the initial intelligibility that guides all positive research. Hence these concepts get their genuine demonstration and 'grounding' only in a corresponding initial exploration of the subject-area."

Husserl underlines:

"Basic concepts"

In the left margin:

As one surveys the area, the subject-matter's formal factors come to the fore in concretely descriptive and (when appropriate) idealizing research.[17]

Husserl's second note:

10.22–25 10.23–26 30.27–30 8.41–9.1

Text in SZ:

"However, since each of these [subject-] areas is itself obtained from the domain of entities themselves, this preliminary research that shapes the basic concepts means nothing less than explicating those entities in terms of the basic structure of their being."

Husserl underlines:

"this preliminary research that shapes the basic concepts means nothing less than explicating those entitites in terms of the basic structure of their being."

In the left margin:

Which is required only in the relevant formal eidetic research (mathematizing in the broadest sense).[18] But what is meant by the basic structure of the being of entities? But then the question: essence and factum.

---

[17] *"Die sachlichen Formalien treten in der Umschau im Gebiet in der konkret deskriptiven und eventuell idealisierenden Forschung hervor."*

[18] *"Dessen bedarf es erst in der sachlich formalen Wesensforschung (Mathematisierung im weitesten Sinn)."* If we take *es* as referring to *das Seiende*, it could read: "Which [the entities] require only...." Husserl actually writes *"Das bedarf es..."* The change to *Dessen* was made in the German edition. It is not entirely clear what the word *"Dessen"* refers to (and the gender of the words is no help here). It might refer (without proper gender agreement) to "preliminary research" (*vorgängige ... Forschung*) or, more immediately to "explication " (*Auslegung*).

Husserl's third note:

10, bottom margin **10, bottom margin** **after 31.10** **after 9.14**

Text in SZ:

The note seems to refer to the text from SZ given immediately above, viz. SZ-1 10.22–25 = SZ-15 10.23–26 = BT-1 30.27–30 = BT-2 8.41–9.1.

In the bottom margin:

All regions of the sciences of the world are segments cut out of a real universum of the world; the basic structure of the world is the relevant [*sachliche*] essence of the world and thus is the what of "entities" [*das Was des "Seienden"*], which are a universum of being – but specifically a universum of worldly entities. If by "entity" we understand something-at-all in formal-ontological generality, then we encounter the question: Is there an apodictic path leading from formal ontology to a real [ontology]? There are no other concepts of "being" here, and thus [no other concepts] of the structure of "being" either.

Husserl's fourth note:

10.39–11.1 **10.39–11.1** **31.8–11** **9.14–16**

Text in SZ:

"Similarly the positive outcome of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* consists not in a 'theory' of knowledge but in the start that it made towards elaborating what nature in general entails."

Husserl underlines:

"what nature in general entails"

In the left margin:

but correlatively

11.3–5 **11.4–6** **31.13–15** **9.18–20**

Text in SZ:

"But such an inquiry itself – ontology in the broadest sense without privileging any particular ontological directions or tendencies – requires a further clue."

Husserl underlines:

"ontology"

In the right margin:

Regarding the structure of the "being" of entities of a [specific] region, and then in general

11.9–13 **11.10–12** **31.18–21** **9.23–26**

Text in SZ; Husserl underlines all but the first three words:

"Specifically, the ontological task of working out (but not construing deductively) a genealogy of the various possible ways of being requires a prior agreement on what we really mean by this expression '*being*.' "

In the right margin:

N.B.

11.17–19 **11.18–20** **31.25–27** **9.27–31**

Text in SZ:

"[The question of being aims at the] condition for the possibility of those very ontologies which are situated prior to the ontic sciences and which found them."

In the right margin:

Does that mean *a priori* sciences? Yes, cf. 13.[19]

11.19–24 **11.20–24** **31.27–30** **9.31–34**

Text in SZ, all italicized in the original:

"All ontology, no matter how rich and firmly compacted a system of categories it has at its disposal, remains basically blind to and a perversion of its ownmost aim, until it adequately clarifies the meaning of being and understands this clarification as its fundamental task."

Husserl brackets the above sentence with a vertical line in the left margin. In the text he underlines:

"All ontology" and "until it adequately clarifies the meaning of being"

In the left margin:

This would be a reproduction of my doctrine, if "clarified" meant constitutively-phenomenologically clarified.

§ 4
The Ontic Priority of the Question of Being

11.34–36 **11.34–36** **32.4–6** **10.1–3**

Text in SZ:

"The sciences, as ways that people act, have this entity's (the human being's) type of being. We denote this entity by the term '*Dasein*.' "

In the left margin:

= human being [*Mensch*]

In the right margin, in cursive:

Dasein - human being [*Dasein - Mensch*].

11.39–12.2 **12.1–2** **32.10–11** **10.6–8**

Text in SZ:

"Here the discussion must anticipate analyses that come later and become genuinely demonstrative only at that point."

Husserl underlines:

"anticipate"

In the left margin:

Does one have to anticipate in this way?

---

[19] At *SZ-1* 13.16–20 = *SZ-15* 13.16–19 = *BT-1* 33.31–35 = *BT-2* 11.19–22 Husserl refers back to this text.

12.3–7 **12.3–7** **32.12–16** **10.9–12**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein is an entity that does not just occur among other entities. Rather, Dasein is ontically distinguished by the fact that, in its being, it is concerned *about* its being. But in that case it belongs to the very structure of Dasein's being that, in its being, Dasein has a relation of being to this being."

In the left margin:

And is this not puzzling at this point and, in the final analysis, throughout?[20]

12.12–13 **12.11–12** **32.21** **10.16–17**

Text in SZ:

"The ontic distinctiveness of Dasein consists in the fact that it *is* ontological."

Husserl underlines:

"ontic" and "ontological"

In the left margin, partly in cursive:

Dasein is ontological.[21]

12.15–17 **12.13–16** **32.23–26** **10.18–21**

Text in SZ:

"If we reserve the term 'ontology' for the explicit theoretical question about the meaning of entities, then what we mean by Dasein's 'being-ontological' should be designated as 'pre-ontological.' "

In the left margin, in cursive and abbreviated:

pre-ontol[ogical]

12.20–26 **12.19–24** **32.29–33.3** **10.23–28**

Husserl's next three notes refer to various parts of this one paragraph.

Husserl's first note:

12.20–21 **12.19–20** **32.29–31** **10.23–24**

Text in SZ:

"That being towards which Dasein can – and always somehow does – comport itself in one way or another, we call '*eksistence* [*Existenz*].' "

In the left margin, underscored:

eksistence[22]

---

[20] At *SZ-1* 12.27–28 = *SZ-15* 12.25–26 = *BT-1* 33.4–5 = *BT-2* 10.29–30 Husserl will find "another" such puzzle.

[21] Compare Husserl's note at *SZ-1* 13.27–28 = *SZ-15* 13.27–28 = *BT-1* 34.6–7 = *BT-2* 11.27–28.

[22] Husserl refers back to this page at *SZ-1* 13.27–28 = *SZ-15* 13.27–28 = *BT-1* 34.6–7 = *BT-2* 11.27–28.

Husserl's second note:

12.21–24 **12.20–23** **32.31–33.1** **10.24–27**

Text in SZ:

"Because we can not determine this entity's essence by assigning a 'what' that indicates its content, and because, on the contrary, its essence consists in always having to be its being as its own,...."

In the right margin:

But that is absurd.

Husserl's third note:

12.24–26 **12.23–24** **33.1–3** **10.27–28**

Text in SZ [continuing the previous sentence]:

"...we have chosen the term 'Dasein' – as a pure expression of [its] being – to designate this entity."

Husserl underlines:

"a pure expression of [its] being"

In the left margin:

?

12.27–28 **12.25–26** **33.4–5** **10.29–30**

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

"Dasein always understands itself in terms of its eksistence, in terms of a possibility of itself: to be or not to be itself."

In the left margin:

Another puzzle.[23]

12.33–34 **12.31–22** **33.9–10** **10.35–36**

Text in SZ:

"The self-understanding that leads in *this* direction we call '*eksistentiel*.' "

In the left margin:

Eksistentiel understanding.
Is this clear?

12.37–41 **12.35–39** **33.12–16** **11.1–4**

Text in SZ:

"The question about [the structure of eksistence] aims at laying out what constitutes eksistence. We call the interconnection of such structures '*eksistentiality*.' The analysis of it has the character of an *eksistential* (not an eksistentiel) understanding."

In the left margin, flowing over into the bottom margin:

Eksistentiality. Analysis of eksistentiality. Eksistential understanding = theoretically interpretative [understanding] of eksistentiality.

---

[23] Perhaps an allusion back to *SZ-1* 12.3–7 = *SZ-15* 12.3–7 = *BT-1* 32.12–16 = *BT-2* 10.9–12, an earlier text that Husserl found "puzzling."

In the top margin of SZ-1 13:

Heidegger transposes or changes the constitutive-phenomenological clarification of all regions of entities and universals, of the total region of the world, into the anthropological; the whole problematic is shifted over: corresponding to the ego there is Dasein, etc. In that way everything becomes ponderously unclear, and philosophically loses its value.

13.2 **13.1–2** **33.16–18** **11.4–6**

Text in SZ:

"The task of an eksistential analytic of Dasein is pre-delineated, as regards its possibility and necessity, in Dasein's ontic structure."

Husserl underlines:

"in Dasein's ontic structure"

In the right margin:

What is an ontological[24] structure as contrasted with eksistentiality? Is that made clear in the present paragraph?

13.16–20 **13.16–19** **33.31–35** **11.19–22**

Text in SZ:

"Thus the ontologies whose theme is entities with a non-Dasein character of being are founded on and motivated by the ontic structure of Dasein itself, a structure that is intrinsically determined by a pre-ontological understanding of being."

Husserl underlines:

"The ontologies whose theme is entities with a non-Dasein character of being"

In the right margin, next to the underlining:

Cf. 11[25]

13.27–28 **13.27–28** **34.6–7** **11.27–28**

Text in SZ:

"Because it is defined by eksistence, Dasein is intrinsically 'ontological.' "

Husserl underlines:

"ontological"

In the right margin:

See 12[26]

---

[24] Has Husserl misread Heidegger's "*in der ontischen Verfassung*" as "*in der ontologischen Verfassung*"?

[25] This is the passage to which Husserl referred above at *SZ-1* 11.17–19, *SZ-15* 11.18–20, *BT-1* 31.25–27 = *BT-2* 9.27–31.

[26] The reference is presumably to *SZ-1* 12.12–13 = *SZ-15* 12.11–12 = *BT-1* 32.21 = *BT-2* 10.16–17 (*ontologisch*) and to *SZ-1* 12.20–21 = *SZ-15* 12.19–20 = *BT-1* 32.29–31 = *BT-2* 10.23–24 (*Existenz*).

13.32–34 **13.32–33** **34.11–12** **11.32–34**

Text in SZ, all underlined:

"Thus Dasein has proven itself to be the entity that, more than any other, must first be interrogated ontologically."

In the right margin:

proven?

14.12–18 **14.11–17** **34.27–34** **12.7–14**

Text in SZ:

"Aristotle's principle,[27] which points back to the ontological thesis of Parmenides,[28] is one that Thomas Aquinas has taken up in a typical discussion. Within the task of deriving the 'transcendentals' [*transcendentia*] – i.e., those characteristics of being that lie beyond every possible generic determination of an entity's content (i.e., beyond every *modus specialis entis*) and that pertain to every 'something' that may exist, whatever it is – the *verum* as well is to be certified as such a *transcendens*."

In the left margin Husserl brackets from "Thomas Aquinas has taken up" to "such a transcendens" and writes:

So there is bit of Thomism embedded in Heidegger.

14.33–36 **14.31–34** **35.7–10** **12.29–32**

Text in SZ:

"But now it has been shown that the ontological analysis of Dasein in general constitutes fundamental ontology and that Dasein thus functions as the entity which, in principle, must be interrogated beforehand with regard to its being."

Husserl underlines:

"shown"

In the left margin Husserl brackets the text and writes:

shown?

---

[27] The principle is found in *De anima*, Γ 8, 431 b 21, which Heidegger here cites and translates as: ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ ὄντα πώς ἐστι: "The soul (of the human being) is, in some way, entities." On February 13, 1952, in his course "*Übungen im Lesen*," Heidegger told students: "*Das πάντα ist in Sein und Zeit aus Versehen herausgeblieben*" ("The πάντα was omitted in *Being and Time* due to an oversight").

[28] Parmenides, fragment 3: τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστίν τε καὶ εἶναι.

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO

The Twofold Task in Working Out the Question of Being. The Method of the Investigation, and its Outline

§ 5

The Ontological Analysis of Dasein as Discovering the Horizon for an Interpretation of the Meaning of Being in General

15.29–31 **15.27–29** **36.22–24** **13.22–14.1**

Text in SZ:

"To be sure, [Dasein's] ownmost being entails having an understanding of that being and always already maintaining itself in a certain interpretation of its being."

In the right margin:

thus, self-consciousness

15.34–35 **15.32** **36.28** **14.4–5**

Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by changing "Bestimmung" to "Besinnung" within the text.

15.36–37 **15. 34–35** **36.29–32** **14.5–8**

Text in SZ:

"Rather, in keeping with a kind of being that belongs to it, Dasein has the tendency to understand its own being in terms of *that* entity to which, for essential reasons, it relates directly and constantly: the 'world.' "

Husserl underlines:

"tendency to understand its own being in terms of *that* entity"

In the right margin:

How is that to be proven?

16.3–6 **16.3–6** **37.3–5** **14.11–14**

Text in SZ:

"Thus the ontico-ontological priority of Dasein is the reason why its specific structure of being – understood as its relevant 'categorial' structure – remains concealed from Dasein."

Husserl underlines:

"concealed"

In the left margin:

concealing [*Verdeckung*]

16.37–41 16.37–41 37.38–38.1 15.2–6

Text in SZ:

"Rather, the kind of access and the kind of interpretation must be chosen in such a way that this entity can show itself in itself and from itself. What is more, the approach should show the entity the way it *usually and generally* is, in its average *everydayness*."

Husserl underlines:

"average *everydayness*"

In the left margin, the first sentence; the rest continues at the bottom of the page:

In my sense, this is the way to an intentional psychology of the personality in the broadest sense, starting from personal life in the world: a founding personal type.

I have placed, over against each other, natural apprehension of the world in natural worldly life (or, this worldly life itself) and philosophical, transcendental apprehension of the world – hence a life which is not a natural immersion in a naïvely pre-accepted world nor a matter of taking-oneself-in-naïve-acceptance as a human being, but which is the idea of a philosophical life determined by philosophy.[29]

17.6–20 17.6–20 38.7–21 15.11–23

The next three comments of Husserl pertain to this one paragraph.

Husserl's first and second comments:

17.8–11 17.8–11 38.9–11 15.13–15

Text in SZ:

"[The analytic of Dasein] cannot attempt to provide a complete ontology of Dasein, even though the latter must certainly be constructed if anything like a 'philosophical' anthropology is to stand on a philosophically adequate basis."[30]

In the right margin:

Ontology of Dasein
and
philosophical anthropology

In the left margin:

Thus merely a lower level [*Unterstufe*]

---

[29] Husserl later refers back to this note at *SZ-1* 43.36–38 = *SZ-15* 43.35–37 = *BT-1* 69.22–24 = *BT-2* 41.18–20, where Heidegger writes that average everydayness "always has been, and always will be, *overlooked* in the explanations of Dasein."

[30] After this sentence the Macquarrie-Robinson translation erroneously inserts a paragraph break.

Husserl's third comment:

17.15–16 **17.15–16** **38.16–17** **15.19–20**

Text in SZ:

"[The analytic of Dasein] merely brings out the being of this entity, without an interpretation of its meaning."

Husserl underlines:

"without an interpretation of its meaning."

In the right margin:

What is an interpretation of meaning?

17.21–22 **17.21–22** **38.22–23** **15.24–25**

Text in SZ:

"The meaning of the being of the entity that we call Dasein will be shown to be *temporality*."

Husserl underlines:

"the meaning of the being"

In the right margin, in cursive:

time

17.30–31 **17.30–31** **39.2–6** **15.33–36**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein *is* in such a way that, just by being, it understands some kind of being. With this connection firmly established, we must show that *time* is that in terms of which Dasein tacitly understands and interprets any form of being."

Husserl underlines all of the first sentence and much of the second.

In the left margin:

This is intentionality of self-consciousness in the direction of the constitutive.

19.3–8 **19.1–7** **40.14–19** **16.38–43**

Text in SZ:

"Because the word 'temporal' ['*zeitlich*'] has been pre-empted by pre-philosophical and philosophical parlance, and because the following investigations will employ that term for another signification, we shall use the phrase the '*time*-determinedness [temporale *Bestimmtheit*] of being' to name the original determination of the meaning of being and of its characters and modes in terms of time."

In the right margin, in cursive:

"time-determinedness"

19.27–31 **19.25–29** **40.36–40** **17.17–21**

Text in SZ:

"If the answer to the question of being is the guiding directive for our investigation, that answer will prove adequate only if it shows that the

specific kind of being of all previous ontology – the fate of its inquiries, findings, and failures – has a certain necessity vis-à-vis Dasein."

In the right margin:

N.B.

§ 6
The Task of a Destruction of the History of Ontology

20.1–2 **20.1–2** **41.9–10** **17.29–30**

Text in SZ:

" 'Historicity' means the being-structure of Dasein's 'being-historical' as such...."[31]

In the left margin, in cursive:

historicity

20.10–13 **20.10–13** **41.18–21** **17.38–41**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein – whatever its current way of being and the understanding of being that goes with it – has grown up in and into a traditional way of interpreting Dasein."

Husserl underlines:

"has grown up...into a traditional way of interpreting Dasein"

In the left margin:

Can one claim this as an eidetic property of Dasein without having brought it to self-giving? And how does that happen except through constitutive and, in addition, genetic analysis? Doesn't that follow from the succeeding lines, according to which the exemplary must first of all be discovered and then brought into eidetic intuition?[32] Doesn't that hold as such for the tradition, in my expanded sense [of tradition]?

21.2–4 **20.40–21.4** **42.18–20** **18.30–32**

Text in SZ:

"[Engaging the question of the meaning of being must ask about its *own* history] so that, by positively appropriating its own past, it might come into full possession of the most proper possibilities of the question."

---

[31] The Macquarrie-Robinson translation erroneously inserts a paragraph break before this sentence.

[32] Husserl is presumably referring to the next paragraph, *SZ-1* 20.18–21 = *SZ-15* 20.18–23 = *BT-1* 41.25–29 = *BT-2* 18.5–9, where Heidegger writes (Macquarrie-Robinson translation): "This elemental historicity of Dasein can remain hidden from Dasein itself. But it can also be discovered in a certain way and be properly cultivated. Dasein can discover tradition, preserve it, and pursue it explicitly. The discovery of tradition and the disclosure of what it 'transmits' and how it transmits it, can be taken hold of as a task in its own right."

In the right margin next to the bracketed text:

Are the historical [possibilities] now all my possibilities, and is my freedom a radical posing of the question?[33]

21.39–22.4 21.38–22.4 43.24–30 19.21–26

Text in SZ:

"Greek ontology and its history – which, by way of various connections and misconnections, determines the conceptuality of philosophy even today – is proof of the fact that *[p. 22]* Dasein understands itself and being in general in terms of the 'world' and that the resultant ontology devolves into a tradition that lets it deteriorate into something obvious, mere material for reworking (as it was for Hegel)."

In the left margin at SZ-1 22.1–4 ("...Dasein understands itself" etc.):

Merely because of the fact of the Greek tradition?

22.14–19 22.13–18 44.1–6 19.35–40

Text in SZ:

In the course of this history certain distinctive domains of being come into view and serve as primary guides for subsequent problematics (the *ego cogito* of Descartes, the subject, the 'I,' reason, spirit, person), but in keeping with the thoroughgoing neglect of the being-question, these problematics remain uninterrogated as to their being and the structure of their being.

In the left margin:

Objection against Hegelian phenomenology, too.

22.24–29 22.24–29 44.11–15 20.1–5

Text in SZ:

"If the being-question is to achieve clarity about its own history, we must loosen up the hardened tradition and dissolve the concealments it has generated. We understand this task as the *destruction* of the traditional content of ancient ontology, carried out with the *guidance of the being-question....*"

In the left margin, in cursive:

destruction

23.16–19 23.16–19 45.4–7 20.34–36

Text in SZ:

"The first and only person who has taken any step towards investigating the dimension of this time-character [*Temporalität*], or who has even allowed the force of the phenomena to draw him in that direction, is Kant."

In the right margin:

Is that true?

---

[33] *"Sind die historischen schon alle meine Möglichkeiten und meine Freiheit radikale Fragestellung?"* Could this have the sense of: Are all my possibilities now historical (etc.)?

The next remark by Husserl might apply not just to the text indicated but to the rest of SZ p. 24 and even some of p. 25.

24.16–19 **24.16–19** **46.1–3** **21.26–28**

Text in SZ:

"In taking over Descartes' ontological position Kant neglects something essential: an ontology of Dasein. This is a decisive omission as regards Descartes' most characteristic tendencies."

In the left margin:

Unfair objections against Descartes

26.21–23 **26.22–24** **49.1–2** **23.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"[Aristotle's treatise on time] has essentially determined all subsequent accounts of time, Bergson's included."

In the left margin, in cursive:

all?[34]

26.33–38 **26.34–27.1** **49.13–18** **23.31–35**

Text in SZ:

Every investigation in this field, where 'the thing itself is deeply veiled,' will avoid overestimating its results, insofar as such an inquiry is constantly forced to face the possibility of disclosing an even more original, more universal horizon whence one might draw the answer to the question, What does '*being*' mean?"

Husserl puts the above text in brackets and underlines:

"possibility of disclosing an even more original, more universal horizon"

In the left margin:

N.B.

§ 7
The Phenomenological Method of Investigation

27.24–28 **27.25–29** **50.2–4** **24.16–19**

Text in SZ:

"Thus this treatise does not subscribe to either a 'standpoint' or a 'direction,' because phenomenology is not and cannot become either of those so as long as it understands itself."

In the right margin:

N.B.

---

[34] Husserl's lectures on time, dating from 1904–1910, were edited and published by Heidegger in the summer or fall of 1928, in Husserl's *Jahrbuch*, volume IX, as: *Vorlesungen zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins*.

28.31–35 **28.31–36** **51.13–15** **25.12–16**

Text in SZ:

"Thus we must *keep in mind* as the meaning of the expression '*phenomenon*': *that-which-shows-itself-in-and-of-itself*: the manifest. Accordingly the φαινόμενα or 'phenomena' are the totality of what lies in the light of day or can be brought to light – what the Greeks sometimes identified simply with τὰ ὄντα (entities)."

Husserl brackets this text. In the left margin next to the second sentence above:

Yes, in the case of unanimous confirmation and as idea.[35]

29.13–14 **29.14–15** **51.34–36** **25.31–33**

Text in SZ:

"We shall allot the term 'phenomenon' to this positive and original signification of φαινόμενον...."

Husserl underlines:

"positive"

In the right margin:

But is it given in this way without further ado?

29.16–18 **29.17–19** **51.37–39** **25.34–36**

Text in SZ:

"But what *both* these terms [viz., 'phenomenon' and 'semblance'] express usually has nothing at all to do with what is called an 'appearance,' or still less a 'mere appearance.' "

In the right margin:

phenomenon and appearance

29.19–29 **29.20–29** **52.1–11** **25.37–26.3**

Text in SZ:

[Perhaps all of, but at least the first five sentences of, the paragraph that begins in Macquarrie-Robinson with: "This is what one is talking about when one speaks of the 'symptoms of a disease....' "]

In the right margin, next to the first five sentences:

That is an expanded, equivocal concept of appearance, but not the one that is always dominant.

---

[35] *"Ja, im Fall einstimmiger Bewährung und als Idee."*

29.33–34 29.34–35 53.1–2 26.10–11

Text in SZ:

"In spite of the fact that 'appearing' is never a self-showing in the sense of 'phenomenon,'...."

Husserl underlines:

" 'appearing' is never"

In the right margin:

?

31.3–4 31.3–4 54.14–15 27.21–22

Text in SZ:

" '*Phenomenon*' – the showing-of-itself-in-and-of-itself – signifies a distinctive way something can be encountered."

In the right margin:

This is entirely too simple.

31.9–12 31.9–12 54.20–23 27.27–30

Text in SZ:

"The bewildering multiplicity of 'phenomena' designated by the words 'phenomenon,' 'semblance,' 'appearance,' 'mere appearance,' can be disentangled only if from the start we understand the concept of phenomenon as: that-which-shows-itself-in-and-of-itself."

In the right margin:

Yes, but then semblance [is] only relative.[36]

31.13–17 31.13–17 54.24–27 27.31–34

Text in SZ:

"If this understanding of the notion of phenomenon leaves undetermined which entity is taken as a phenomenon, and if in general it leaves open whether what shows itself is always an entity or whether it is some being-character of an entity...."

In the right margin:

Leaves open.

N.B.

---

[36] This marginal note and the following one are difficult to decipher and interpret. (1) The earliest transcription of Husserl's marginalia, by Eugen Fink, reads the two shorthand notes as one: "*Ja, aber dann nur relativ, die Schein offen lassen.*" Fink applies the note to *SZ-1* 31.10–17 (= *SZ-15* 31.10–17 = *BT-1* 54.21–28 = *BT-2* 27.28–35). I am grateful to Professor Burt Hopkins for sharing the Fink transcription with me. (2) Breeur also reads the two notes as one, but transcribes them differently: "*Ja, aber dann nur relativ, der Schein offen läßt.*" (Due to a printer's error the word *läßt* appears in Breeur's German edition as *laßt.*) Breeur applies the words to *SZ-15* 31.11–12 (= *SZ-1* 31.11–12 = *BT-1* 22–23 = *BT-2* 27.29–30. (3) I read Husserl's shorthand as constituting two notes that refer to two distinct sentences: (a) "*Ja, aber dann nur relativ der Schein.*" and (b) "*Offen läßt.*"

Husserl's next three comments are densely located in both the left and right margins beside the following sentences:

31.20–22 **31.17–22** **54.28–33** **27.35–40**

Text in SZ:

"If we understand 'that which shows itself' as an entity accessible through the empirical 'intuition' in, say, Kant's sense, then in this case the formal conception of 'phenomenon' has a legitimate employment. In this usage 'phenomenon' has the sense of the *ordinary* conception of phenomenon. But this ordinary conception is not the phenomenological conception."

In the right margin:

N.B.

Husserl underlines:

"legitimate"

In the left margin:

Why? I still cannot anticipate the entity.[37]

Husserl underlines:

"*ordinary* conception of phenomenon"

In the right margin:

Thus, related to entities.

31.34–35 **31.34–35** **55.9–10** **28.8–9**

Text in SZ:

"If, however, the phenomenological conception of phenomenon is to be understood at all...."

In the right margin, and underscored:

the phenomenological concept of phenomenon
see 35![38]

32.29–30 **32.28–29** **56.10–11** **28.40–41**

Text in SZ:

" *Discourse* 'shows' ἀπό..., that is, from the very thing that the discourse is about."

In the left margin:

thus, seen on the thing?

33.36–39 **33.35–38** **57.17–22** **29.40–43**

Text in SZ:

"What is 'true' in the purest and most original sense – i.e., that which only discovers such that it can never cover over – is pure νοεῖν, the direct observant apprehension of the simplest determinations of the being of entities as such."

---

[37] "*Warum? Ich kann doch nicht das Seiende vorwegnehmen.*"

[38] Presumably this refers ahead to *SZ-1* 35.30–31 = *SZ-15* 35.29 = *BT-1* 59.32–35 = *BT-2* 31.21–24, where Heidegger declares the proper phenomenon of phenomenology to be being.

In the left margin:

Why the determinations of being, why the simplest?

34.1–4 **34.1–4** **57.25–28** **30.3–6**

Text in SZ:

"When something no longer takes the form of pure showing but instead shows something by having recourse to something else – and so in each case shows something *as* something – it acquires, along with this structure of synthesis, the possibility of covering over."

Husserl underlines:

"something else" and "*as* something"

In the left margin:

?

34.38–40 **34.37–38** **59.2–4** **30.35–37**

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

"The word 'phenomenology' does not designate the object of its own investigations, nor does it characterize their subject-matter."

In the left margin:

But phenomenology as universal science of phenomena in general!

[Immediately following, in the bottom margin:]

If one takes a phenomenon as the appearance-of, then the universal science of appearances, which necessarily becomes the universal [science] of what-appears as such,[39] is at the same time equivalent to phenomenology in the other sense, or, what comes down to the same thing, is equivalent to ontology (because Heidegger defines phenomenon "positively" [p.] 31.[40])

35.6–9 **35.6–9** **59.10–13** **30.42–31.3**

Text in SZ:

"Here 'description' does not signify a procedure like that of, say, botanical morphology; instead, the term has a prohibitive sense: avoiding any non-demonstrative determination."

In the right margin:

All the same, that is not adequate.

---

[39] *...die universale Wissenschaft von den Erscheinungen, die notwendig universale von dem Erscheinenden als solchen wird,...*" Perhaps: "...the universal science of appearances, which becomes the necessarily universal [science] of what-appears as such,...."

[40] What text is Husserl referring to? Heidegger uses the adjective *positiven* (and Husserl underlines it) at *SZ-1* 29.13 = *SZ-15* 29.15 = *BT-1* 51.35 = *BT-2* 25.32 when he writes "We shall allot the term 'phenomenon' to this positive and original meaning of φαινόμενον," namely: that-which-shows-itself. Or perhaps Husserl is referring to *SZ-1* 31.21 = *SZ-15* 31.21 = *BT-1* 54.32 = *BT-2* 27.38–39, where Heidegger speaks of "the *ordinary* conception of phenomenon," which Husserl glosses with: "Thus, related to entities." Husserl's word "'positively'" would then mean "as something posited in the world." But in the following sentence Heidegger explicitly states that this ordinary conception of phenomenon is not the phenomenological conception.

35.30–31 **35.29** **59.32–35** **31.21–24**

Text in SZ:

"Yet that which remains *hidden* in an egregious sense, or which relapses into being *covered up* again, or which shows itself only '*in disguise*,' is not just this or that entity but the *being* of entities, as our previous observations have shown."

Husserl underlines:

"the *being* of entities"

In the right margin, partially in cursive:

being?[41]

35.31–32 **35.29–31** **59.35–36** **31.24–26**

Text in SZ:

"It [i.e., the being of entities] can be covered up so extensively that it becomes forgotten and the question about being and its meaning vanishes."

Husserl underlines:

"forgotten"

In the right margin:

forgotten

35.32–35 **35.31–34** **59.37–40** **31.26–28**

Text in SZ:

"Thus that which, distinctively and in terms of its most proper content, demands to become a phenomenon, is what phenomenology has taken into its 'grasp' thematically as its object."

In the right margin:

N.B. phenomenon
63[42]

35.36–37 **35.35–36** **60.1–2** **31.29–30**

Text in SZ:

"Phenomenology is the way of access to, and the way of demonstratively determining, that which is to be the theme of ontology."

In the right margin:

I would say so, too, but in an entirely different sense.

36.8–9 **36.8–9** **60.14** **32.1**

Text in SZ:

"The ways phenomena can be covered up are many."

---

[41] See *SZ-1* 31.34–35 = *SZ-15* 31.34–35 = *BT-1* 55.9–10 = *BT-2* 28.8–9, where Husserl's exclamation point seems to record his amazement that Heidegger here declares the proper phenomenon of phenomenology to be being.

[42] This refers ahead to *SZ-1* 63.18–20 = *SZ-15* 63.16–17 = *BT-1* 91.15–16 = *BT-2* 59.14–15: "We formally defined 'phenomenon' in the phenomenological sense as that which shows itself as being and being-structure."

In the left margin:

ways of being covered up

36.36–41 **36.36–40** **61.8–13** **32.27–31**

Text in SZ:

"The ways being and the structures of being are encountered in the form of phenomenon must first of all be *won* from the objects of phenomenology. Thus the *starting point* of the analysis, along with the *access* to the phenomenon and the *way through* the dominant coverings-up, have to be methodically secured in ways proper to them."

In the left margin:

N.B. My conception [is here] given a new interpretation

37.20–21 **37.21–22** **61.35–36** **33.9–10**

Text in SZ:

"As regards its subject matter, phenomenology is the science of the being of entities – ontology."

In the right margin, in cursive:

Heid[egger]

38.14–15 **38.16** **62.27** **34.3–4**

Text in SZ:

"Every disclosure of being as the *transcendens* is *transcendental* knowledge."

In the left margin, in cursive:

transcendental

38.18–25 **38.18–24** **62.29–35** **34.6–12**

Text in SZ:

"Ontology and phenomenology are not two different disciplines that, along with others, belong to philosophy. The two terms characterize philosophy itself according to [respectively] its object and its way of treating [that object]. Philosophy is universal phenomenological ontology[43] growing out of a hermeneutics of Dasein, and this hermeneutics, as an analysis of *eksistence*, has tied the Ariadne's Thread of all philosophical questioning to the place from which that questioning *arises* and to which it *returns*."

In the left margin, next to the entire paragraph:

N.B.

In the left margin next to the last two lines:

Cf. 430[44]

---

[43] At this point *SZ-15* bears a comma (which is missing in *SZ-1*) after "*Ontologie*."

[44] Husserl erroneously writes "430" instead of "436." The correct reference is to *SZ-1* 436.34–38 = *SZ-15* 436.27–31 = *BT-1* 487.8–11 = *BT-2* 397.19–22, where the present sentence cited is repeated verbatim and bears Heidegger's footnote referring back to "§7, p. 38," that is, to the present passage. At *SZ-1* 436 Husserl underlines Heidegger's sentence and marks it with "N.B."

PART ONE

THE INTERPRETATION OF DASEIN IN TERMS OF TEMPORALITY, AND THE ELUCIDATION OF TIME AS THE TRANSCENDENTAL HORIZON FOR THE QUESTION OF BEING

DIVISION ONE
PREPARATORY FUNDAMENTAL ANALYSIS OF DASEIN

CHAPTER ONE
Exposition of the Task of a Preparatory Analysis of Dasein

§ 9
The Theme of the Analysis of Dasein

42.1–2 **42.1–2** **67.7–8** **39.7–8**

Text in SZ:

"As an entity with this kind of being, [Dasein] has been delivered over to its own to-be. What this entity itself is always concerned about is *being*."[45]

Husserl underlines:

"to its own to-be"

In the left margin:

Is this given as a phenomenon?

42.8–10 **42.7–10** **67.13–15** **39.13–15**

Text in SZ:

"...when we choose the term 'eksistence' to designate the being of this entity, that word does not and cannot have the ontological meaning of the traditional term *existentia*...."

In the left margin:

eksistence and the usual concept of existence

---

[45] In *SZ-1* the first sentence is: "*Als Seiendes dieses Seins ist es seinem eigenen Zu-sein überantwortet*" and that is the text we translate here. Beginning with the seventh edition (1953), "*Zu-sein*" is changed to "*Sein*," so as to read: "As an entity with this kind of being, it has been handed over to its own being." See Bast and Delfosse, *Handbuch zum Textstudium*, p. 413.

42.10–11 42.10–11 67.15–16 39.15–16

Text in SZ:

"...ontologically *existentia* means the same as *just-being-there* [*Vorhandensein*]."

In the left margin, in cursive:

just-being-there

42.12–15 42.12–15 67.17–20 39.18–20

Text in SZ:

"Confusion will be avoided by always using the interpretative expression *thereness* for the term *existentia* and by reserving 'eksistence,' as a determination of being, to Dasein alone."

In the left margin:

Is that exhibited "phenomenally"?

42.16 42.16 67.21 40.1

Text in SZ, italicized in SZ:

"Dasein's 'essence' consists in its eksistence."

In the left margin:

Cf. 313f.[46]

42.20–22 42.19–22 67.25–27 40.4–7

Text in SZ:

"All the being-this-way-or-that of this entity is primarily being. Hence the term 'Dasein,' with which we designate this entity, does not express its 'what' (such as 'table,' 'house,' or 'tree') but [its] being."

In the margin:

N.B.[47]

42.41 42.38–40 68.15–17 40.23–25

Text in SZ:

"The only reason why [Dasein] can have lost itself, or may not yet have achieved itself, is that, according to its essence, it can be *authentic*, that is, can belong to itself."

In the left margin:

"authentic"

---

[46] Presumably a *lapsus* for p. "318f." At *SZ-1* 318.3–6 = *SZ-15* 318.1–4 = *BT-1* 365.35–37 = *BT-2* 293.19–21 Heidegger writes: "...if the self belongs to the essential determinations of Dasein -- whose 'essence,' however, consists in *eksistence*...," and in the left margin at that point Husserl writes: "which, however, is questionable from the beginning."

[47] Husserl's comment might apply to the previous sentence, too.

43.11 43.10–12 68.26–29 40.34–36

Text in SZ:

"...an analysis of this entity is confronted with a peculiar phenomenal domain. This entity never has the kind of being that belongs to something just-there within the world."

In the margin:

N.B.

43.34–35 43.33–34 69.20–21 41.16–17

Text in SZ:

"This everyday undifferented character of Dasein is what we call '*averageness*.' "

In the right margin:

averageness

43.36–38 43.35–37 69.22–24 41.18–20

Text in SZ:

"And because this average everydayness makes up what is ontically immediate about this entity, it always has been, and always will be, *overlooked* in the explanations of Dasein."

In the right margin:

On that, cf. my remark [p.] 16[48]

44.1 44.1 69.27 41.24

Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:

[citing St. Augustine:] "laboro in meipso"

In the left margin:

but just-there

44.25–27 44.24–25 70.8–11 42.3–6

Text in SZ:

"Because the characteristics of Dasein's being are defined in terms of eksistentiality, we call them *eksistentials*. They are to be sharply distinguished from the determinations of the being of non-Dasein entities, which determinations we call *categories*."

In the margin, partly in cursive:

eksistentials and categories

45.7–8 45.6–7 71.3–5 42.25–26

Text in SZ:

"...entities are either a *who* (eksistence) or a *what* (thereness in the broadest sense)."

---

[48] This refers to Husserl's extended note above at *SZ-1* 16.37–41 = *SZ-15* 16.37–41 = *BT-1* 37.38–38.1 = *BT-2* 15.2–6, where Heidegger first introduced the notion of "average everydayness."

In the right margin, in cursive:
who – what

§ 10
Distinguishing the Analysis of Dasein from Anthropology, Psychology, and Biology

45.26–29 **45.25–28** **71.22–25** **43.2–3**
Text in SZ:
"We have to show that, despite their material fruitfulness, all previous inquiries and investigations focused on Dasein have missed the authentic *philosophical* problem...."
In the right margin:
N.B.

46.1 **46.1** **71.38** **43.16**
Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:
"*cogito sum*"
In the left margin, in cursive:
Descartes

46.3–15 **46.3–15** **71.39–72.18** **43.18–43.35**
Text in SZ:
[From: "On the other hand, he leaves the sum *entirely unexplained" to "a notable failure to see the need for inquiring about the being of the entities thus designated."]*
In the left margin, in cursive:
objections

47.2–5 **47.2–4** **73.1–3** **44.15–18**
Text in SZ:
"But these limitations of Dilthey and Bergson are the common property of all the trends of 'personalism' and all the tendencies towards philosophical anthropology that they have determined."
Husserl underlines:
"personalism" and "philosophical anthropology"
In the right margin:
objections

47.5–7 **47.5–7** **73.4–6** **44.18–20**
Text in SZ:
"Even the fundamentally more radical and clear phenomenological interpretation of personality does not broach the question of Dasein's being."
In the right margin:
N.B.

47.10 47.10 73.6–10 44.20–23

Text in SZ:

"Despite all their differences regarding questions, execution, and world-view-orientation, Husserl's and Scheler's interpretations of personality agree on what they are against."

Husserl underlines:

"Husserl"

Keyed to the word "Husserl" is the printed footnote number 1 at the bottom of the page; see the next entry.

47, note 1 47, note 1 489, note ii (H. 47) 400, note 2

Text in SZ:

"The fundamental orientation of the problematic is already visible in the treatise "Philosophy as Rigorous Science," *Logos* I (1910), p. 319."[49]

In the right margin:

?

48.23 48.23 74.5 45.15

Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by changing "verrechnet" to "errechnet" within the text.

49.26–33 49.25–32 75.9–16 46.16–23

Text in SZ:

"In modern anthropology these two clues intertwine with the methodological starting point of the *res cogitans*, i.e., consciousness, or the matrix of lived experience. However, insofar as even *cogitationes* remain ontologically undefined, or are again taken tacitly and 'obviously' as some 'data' whose 'being' is beyond questioning, the anthropological problematic remains undefined in its decisive ontological foundations."

In the margin:

N.B.

50.14–17 50.13–16 75.34–36 46.38–41

Text in SZ:

"On the other hand, we have to remind ourselves that these ontological foundations can never be disclosed after-the-fact, by way of hypotheses, from empirical material...."

In the left margin:

N.B.

---

[49] The article originally appeared in March, 1911, and the correct reference for the article is *Logos* I (1911), p. 319: in the newer edition: Edmund Husserl, "Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft" in *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1911–1921)*, edited by Thomas Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp, *Husserliana XXV*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1987, pp. 37–38 (see p. 337 for the original publication date); and in the E.T.: Edmund Husserl, *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*, translated by Quentin Lauer, New York: Harper & Row, 1965, pp. 117–118. The passage to which Heidegger refers opens a discussion of the psychophysical attitude.

Underneath that:

However, [they are] indeed investigated after-the-fact, although obviously not empirically disclosed.

§ 11
The Eksistential Analysis and the Interpretation of Primitive Dasein. The Difficulties of Achieving a "Natural Conception of World"

52.4–7 **52.4–7** **76.38–41** **48.1–4**

Text in SZ:

"This task includes a *desideratum* that has long troubled philosophy but that philosophy has continually refused to achieve: *the elaboration of the idea of a 'natural conception of the world.'* "

In the margin:

?

52.19–22 **52.19–21** **77.11–13** **48.14–16**

Text in SZ:

"And since 'world' is itself a *constitutivum* of Dasein, conceptually elaborating the phenomenon of world requires an insight into the basic structures of Dasein."

Husserl brackets this and the previous sentence and underlines all but the first two words. In the left margin:

N.B.

DIVISION ONE

CHAPTER TWO
Being-in-a-world in General as the Basic Structure of Dasein

§ 12
A Preliminary Sketch of Being-in-a-world, in Terms of an Orientation towards Being-in as such

53.2–4 **53.3–5** **78.12–14** **49.12–14**

Text in SZ:

"Mineness belongs to eksistent Dasein as the condition of the possibility of authenticity and inauthenticity."

In the right margin:

cf. 43[50]

[50] Presumably the reference is to *SZ-1* 43.1–4 = *SZ-15* 42.40–43.3 = *BT-1* 68.17–20 = *BT-2* 40.25–28, where Heidegger asserts that authenticity and inauthenticity are determined by "mineness."

53.7–9 **53.7–9** **78.16–18** **49.16–18**

Text in SZ:

"Nevertheless, these determinations of Dasein's being must now be seen and understood *a priori*, on the basis of [Dasein's] being-structure, which we call *being-in-a-world*."

In the right margin, in cursive:

being-in-a-world

53.35 **53.33** **79.11** **50.16**

Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by crossing out "Wesens" and by writing "Daseins" in cursive in the left margin.

53.39 **53.38** **79.15** **50.22**

Text in SZ:

"What does *being-in* mean?"

In the right margin, in cursive:

being-in

55.22–27 **55.22–28** **81.27–35** **52.1–7**

Text in SZ:

"The presupposition for [a chair 'touching' the wall] would be that the wall could 'actively' *encounter* the chair.[51] An entity can touch an entity that is just-there within the world only if the first entity, by its very nature, has its kind of being as being-in – that is, if, along with its Da-sein, there is already revealed to it some sort of world from out of which the second entity, by way of the touch, can open itself up in a way that lets it become accessible in its just-thereness."

Husserl underlines:

"*encounter*"

In the right margin alongside both sentences:

Only an ego can encounter; a human being can encounter another [human being] and things, because the human being is a real enworlded [*verweltlichtes*] ego [endowed] with all [the] relevant monadic structures.

55.29 **55.29** **81.36** **52.7–9**

Text in SZ:

"Two entities that are just-there within the world and that, in addition, are intrinsically *worldless*, can never 'touch' each other, nor can one 'be in the presence of' the other."

Underlined with discrete dashes under each letter:

"*worldless*"

In the left margin:

= not an intentional ego related to the world

---

[51] "*...daß die Wand 'für' den Stuhl* begegnen *könnte.*"

55.33–34 55.33–34 82.1–5 52.9–14

Text in SZ:

"The clause 'that, in addition, are worldless,' is not to be omitted, because even an entity that is not worldless – for example, Dasein itself – is just-there 'in' the world; or more precisely: with some legitimacy and within certain limits it *can* be *grasped* as just-there."

In the right margin:

N.B.

In the left margin:

Dasein graspable as something just-there

56.4–5 56.4–5 82.14–16 52.23–24

Text in SZ:

"The factuality of the *factum* Dasein – which every Dasein always is – we call its *facticity*."

In the left margin, in cursive:

facticity

56.36–57.2 56.36–57.2 83.10–16 53.8–14

Text in SZ:

"By way of examples, the multiplicity of these ways of being-in may be indicated by the following list: having to do with something, producing something, ordering up and looking after something, employing something, relinquishing something and letting it go, undertaking, accomplishing, exploring, interrogating, treating, discussing, defining.... These ways of being-in have their kind of being (which still must be characterized in detail) as *concern*."

In the left margin towards the bottom of p. 56:

ways of being-in-a-world – concern

57.11–15 57.11–14 83.24–27 53.23–25

Text in SZ:

"Over against these pre-scientific, ontic meanings, the word 'concern' [*Besorgen*] will be used in the present investigation as an ontological term (an eksistential) indicating the being of a possible being-in-a-world."

Underlined twice:

" 'concern' "

In the right margin, in cursive:

concern

57.15–18 **57.14–17** **83.27–84.1** **53.25–28**

Text in SZ:

"We have chosen the term ['concern'] not because Dasein is usually and in large measure economical and 'practical,' but in order to make it clear that Dasein's very being is *care* [Sorge]."

In the right margin, in cursive:

care

57.26–29 **57.25–27** **84.9–11** **53.36–38**

Text in SZ:

"Given what we have said, being-in is not a 'property' that Dasein sometimes has and sometimes does not, such that Dasein could just as well *be without* it as with it."

Husserl underlines:

"being-in...not a 'property' that Dasein sometimes has and sometimes does not..."

In the right margin:

But that does not belong to the concept of a property.[52]

57.39 **57.38** **84.21–22** **54.9–10**

Text in SZ:

"The saying, so much in use these days, that 'Human beings have their lived world' [*Umwelt*]...."

In the right margin:

human beings – lived world

58.1–4 **58.1–3** **84.24–27** **54.12–15**

Text in SZ:

"As an entity that essentially is [being-in], Dasein can explicitly discover the entities it encounters in the lived world; can know about them; can dispose over them; can *have* 'world.' "

In the left margin:

But only what has constituted itself can encounter [something], and that is what provides the deeper structures of having-a-world, of a worldly being, of an ego.

58.35–39 **58.34–38** **85.20–26** **55.2–7**

Text in SZ:

"But this business of 'somehow seeing, yet mostly misinterpreting' is itself based on nothing less than this very being-structure of Dasein, according to which ontologically Dasein usually understands itself (and that means: understands its being-in-a-world) in terms of *those* entities (and

[52] A vertical arrow in the right margin might indicate that Husserl's remark applies to the remainder of the paragraph as well.

their being) that Dasein itself is *not* but that it encounters 'within' its world."

Husserl brackets from "nothing less" to the end of the sentence.

In the left margin, flowing over into the bottom margin:

This is unclear. The difficulty lies in the constitution of the human being, as the constitution of a reality that is intrinsically personal, and the difficulty can be overcome only by clarifying both constitution and phenomenological reduction.

58.41–59.3 **58.40–59.2** **85.28–31** **55.9–11**

Text in SZ:

"If [Dasein's being-structure] is now to become [explicitly] known, the *knowing* that becomes explicit in such a task takes *itself* (as a knowing of world) as the exemplary relation of the 'soul' to the world."

In the right margin:

I cannot go along with this whole interpretation.[53]

59.21–25 **59.20–24** **86.10–14** **55.28–32**

Text in SZ:

"This 'subject-object-relationship' has to be presupposed. This presupposition is *de facto* unimpeachable, but that is precisely why it remains a truly disastrous presupposition so long its ontological necessity, and especially its ontological meaning, are left in the dark."

In the left margin:

Yes, because the entire constitution of being-an-object is skipped over. But the fault lies with objectivism and naturalism.

59.29–31 **59.28–29** **86.19–20** **55.37–38**

Text in SZ:

"...because of this primacy accorded to knowledge, we have been misled in our understanding of [being-in's] ownmost kind of being..."

In the left margin:

?

[53] Husserl's remark may apply to the next sentence, too: "Therefore, knowing the world (νοεῖν), or addressing and discussing the 'world' (λόγος), functions as the primary mode of being-in-a-world, without the latter being conceptualized as such."

§ 13
Being-in is Exemplified in a Founded Mode. Knowing the World

60.1–6 **60.2–7** **87.1–4** **56.9–14**

Text in SZ:

"But no sooner was the 'phenomenon of knowing the world' grasped than it got interpreted in a 'superficial' formal manner. The evidence for this is the procedure (still customary today) of setting up knowing as a 'relation between subject and object' – a procedure in which there lurks as much 'truth' as vacuity. But subject and object do not coincide with Dasein and the world."

In the left margin, in cursive:

Objections

60.10–12 **60.11–13** **87.8–10** **56.17–18**

Text in SZ:

"When we think about [knowledge as being in and towards the world], we usually come up with an entity called 'nature' as the object of such knowledge."

In the left margin:

Maybe not. Can I not direct myself first of all to subjectivity?

60.17 **60.17** **87.12–13** **56.22–23**

Text in SZ:

"In any case, [knowing] is not externally ascertainable as, let us say, bodily properties are."

Husserl underlines:

"bodily"

In the left margin:

bodily-corporeal? [*leiblich-körperlich?*]

60.21 **60.22** **87.15–18** **56.25–27**

Text in SZ:

"Now the more unequivocally one maintains that knowing is primarily and properly 'inside' and certainly does not have the kind of being that physical and mental entities do..."

Husserl underlines:

"physical and mental"

In the left margin:

?

and mental?

60.36–39 **60.36–40** **87.30–35** **56.39–57.3**

Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:

"But when one asks: What is the positive meaning of the 'inside' of immanence in which knowing is first enclosed? or: How is the being-character of this 'being-inside' of knowledge grounded in the kind of being of a subject? – then silence reigns."

In the left margin:

But not in phenomenology.

61.9–15 **61.9–14** **88.5–10** **57.10–16**

Text in SZ:

"With reference to the phenomenal finding (viz.: '*Knowledge is one mode-of-being of being-in-a-world*') one might object: 'Such an interpretation of knowing nullifies the problem of knowledge. For, what is left to ask about once you *presuppose* that knowing is already with the very world that it is supposed to reach only in the subject's act of transcending?' "

In the right margin, in cursive:

good

61.21–24 **61.20–23** **88.16–19** **57.22–25**

Text in SZ:

"As we now ask what shows up in the phenomenal findings of knowing, we must keep in mind that knowing is itself priorly grounded in being-already-with-a-world, and the latter is what makes up the essence of Dasein's being."

In the right margin, in cursive:

founded [*fundiert*][54]

61.32–36 **61.31–34** **88.28–31** **57.32–36**

Text in SZ:

[Regarding *Nur-noch-verweilen*, 'just hanging around':] "*On the basis* of, and *as* a mode of, this kind of being towards a world – which lets the entity that we meet within the world be met merely in its pure '*looks*' (εἶδος) – an explicit looking-at such an encountering entity becomes possible."

In the right margin:

What does "on the basis of" mean?

Husserl underlines:

"an explicit looking-at"

In the right margin:

Yet, isn't this [looking] also a [kind of] concern?

---

[54] Cf. also *SZ-1* 71.35–37 = *SZ-15* 71.33–35 = *BT-1* 101.23–25 = *BT-2* 67.18–20.

61.40–62.1–3 **61.40–62.1** **89.1–3** **58.1–3**

Text in SZ:

"In this kind of '*just hanging around*' – as a refraining from all handling and utilizing – there is effected the *perception* of the just-there."

In the left margin of p. 62:

Only of the just-there
And experiencing and knowing can indeed be a major help for other [kinds of] concern, [and] so they too are [forms of] concern.[55]

62.15–28 **62.13–26** **89.15–90.5** **58.13–31**

Text in SZ:

"In directing itself towards... and in grasping [something], Dasein does not somehow first exit from the inner sphere in which it was first encapsulated. Rather, in keeping with its primary kind of being, Dasein is always already 'outside' with the entity it encounters in an already disclosed world. And Dasein's lingering with and determining of an entity that is to be known is not some sort of abandoning of the inner sphere. Instead, even in this 'being-outside' with an object, Dasein is – so long as we understand the word correctly – 'within'; that is, as a cognitive being-in-a-world, Dasein itself is that 'within.' Moreover, perceiving the known does not mean going out and grabbing it, and then returning with one's captured prize to the 'closet' of consciousness. Instead, in perceiving, retaining, and preserving, the knowing Dasein, *as Dasein, remains outside*. In 'merely' knowing about an entity's matrix-of-being, in 'only' having an idea of it, in 'simply' thinking about it, I am just as much with entities out there in the world as I am when I have an *originary* grasp of them. Even the forgetting of something – wherein apparently every relation-of-being to the formerly known gets effaced – must be conceived *as a modification of the original being-in*, and the same goes for all delusion and error.

In the left margin:

But how can all this be clarified except through my doctrine of intentionality (validity), especially as experiencing?[56] What is said here is my own doctrine, but without its deeper grounding.

62.41–63.2 **62.37–40** **90.15–17** **58.40–42**

Text in SZ:

"Knowing is a mode of Dasein founded upon being-in-a-world. Therefore, being-in-a-world, as a basic structure, needs to be interpreted *first*."

In the right margin of p. 63:

? Objections

---

[55] This second sentence of Husserl's comment could refer to the next two, or even three, sentences in *SZ*.

[56] "*...durch meine Lehre von der Intentionalität (Geltung) und zunächst der erfahrenden?*"

DIVISION ONE

CHAPTER THREE
The Worldhood of a World

§ 14
The Idea of the Worldhood of a World

63.15–16 **63.13–14** **91.12–13** **59.11–13**

Text in SZ:

"But this remains obviously a pre-phenomenological 'business' that cannot be phenomenologically relevant at all."

Husserl underlines:

"that cannot be phenomenologically relevant at all"

In the left margin:

?

63.18–20 **63.16–17** **91.15–16** **59.14–15**

Text in SZ:

"We formally defined 'phenomenon' in the phenomenological sense as that which shows itself as being and as being-structure."

In the right margin:

35[57]

64.20–21 **64.17–18** **92.29–30** **60.23–24**

Text in SZ:

" 'Worldhood' is an ontological concept and refers to the structure of a constitutive moment of being-in-a-world."

In the left margin, in cursive:

worldhood[58]

64.29–32 **64.26–28** **92.38–41** **60.32–34**

Text in SZ:

"The task of the phenomenological 'description' of a world is so far from being obvious that even an adequate definition of it requires essential ontological clarifications."

In the left margin:

?

---

[57] This refers back to *SZ-1* 35.30–35 and .38–40 = *SZ-15* 35.29–34 and .37–39 = *BT-1* 59.34–40 and 60.3–5 = *BT-2* 31.24–28 and 31.31–33, where Heidegger declares the proper phenomenon of phenomenology to be the being of entities: its meaning, modifications, and derivatives.

[58] Husserl will refer back to this passage at *SZ-1* 65.12–13 = *SZ-15* 65.10–11 = *BT-1* 93.18–19 = *BT-2* 61.10–11.

64.38 64.34 93.5 60.39

Text in SZ:

"1. 'World' is used..."

In the left margin, at the beginning of Heidegger's four definitions of the notion of "world":

concepts of world

64.41 (last line of the page) 64.38 93.7–8 60.41–42

Text in SZ:

"2. 'World' functions as an ontological term and means the being of the entities mentioned in number 1."

Husserl underlines:

"being"

In the margin at the bottom of the page:

Inversion of all natural discourse![59]

65.5–8 65.3–6 93.12–15 61.4–6

Text in SZ:

"3. 'World' can be understood again in an ontic sense, but this time not as the entities that Dasein essentially is not – entities that can be met within the world – but as that '*wherein*' a factical Dasein as such 'lives.' "

Husserl underlines:

"as that '*wherein*' a factical Dasein as such 'lives.' "

In the right margin, in cursive:

= world

65.12–13 65.10–11 93.18–19 61.10–11

Text in SZ:

"4. Finally, 'world' designates the ontological-eksistential concept of *worldhood*."

In the right margin:

see previous page[60]

65.22–24 65.20–22 93.30–32 61.20–22

Text in SZ:

"A glance at [all] previous ontology shows that to miss Dasein's structure as being-in-a-world entails *skipping over* the phenomenon of worldhood."

In the right margin:

including phenomenological [ontology]?

?

---

[59] It is not entirely clear that Husserl's remark is specifically related to the word "being" or even to the sentence from *SZ* cited here.

[60] The reference is to *SZ-1* 64.20–21 = *SZ-15* 64.17–18 = *BT-1* 92.29–30 = *BT-2* 60.23–24.

65.34–36 **65.32–34** **94.7–10** **61.31–34**

Text in SZ:

"But even the phenomenon of 'nature' – for example, in the sense of Romanticism's concept of nature – can be grasped ontologically only in terms of the concept of world, that is, in terms of the analysis of Dasein."

In the right margin:

The phenomenon of "nature": from the outset what is meant here is not self-given nature but the "being" of nature.

66.9 **66.8** **94.24** **62.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"Being-in-a-world, and thus the world as well, must become the theme of the analysis, within the horizon of average everydayness as Dasein's *most immediate* kind of being."

In the left margin:

What does "most immediate" [*nächsten*] mean?

66.13 **66.12** **94.27** **62.12**

Text in SZ:

"The most immediate world of everyday Dasein is the *lived world* [*Umwelt*]."

In the left margin, in cursive:

lived world

A.
The Analysis of the Lived World and of Worldhood in General

§ 15
The Being of the Entities Encountered in a Lived World

67.1 **66.38** **95.16** **62.39**

Text in SZ:

"We shall phenomenologically exhibit the being of the most immediately encountered entities by using the clue of everyday being-in-a-world, which we also call *dealings in* a world, *with* innerworldly entities."

In the right margin, in cursive:

dealings

67.3–6 **67.2–5** **95.18–21** **63.1–3**

Text in SZ:

"But as was shown, the most immediate type of dealing is not bare perceptual knowledge but a handling-utilizing concern that has its own kind of 'knowledge.' "

Husserl underlines:

"the most immediate type of dealing"

In the right margin:

What does "most immediate" mean?

Husserl underlines:

" 'knowledge' "

In the left margin:

Why knowledge?

67.26 **67.24–25** **96.8–10** **63.20–26**

Text in SZ:

"The phenomenologically pre-thematic entity – in this case, something you utilize, something you run across in production – becomes accessible by way of a self-transposition into such concern. In a strict sense, to speak of self-transposition is misleading, for you do not need to first transpose yourself into the kind of being that goes with concernful dealings. Everyday Dasein always already *is* in this manner...."

Husserl underlines:

"...by way of a self-transposition into such concern."

In the right margin:

But of course we have to bring a concern present to mind or reflect on one that we find in process, specifically: "look at" and question it!

67.40 **67.38** **96.24** **63.32–34**

Text in SZ:

"...Which entities should be taken as the pre-thematic theme and established as the pre-phenomenal basis?

"One might answer: 'things.' "

Husserl underlines:

" 'things' "

In the right margin:

?

68.20–21 **68.19–20** **97.3–4** **64.12–13**

Text in SZ:

"An entity that we encounter in concern is called an *implement* [*Zeug*]."

In the left margin, in cursive:

implement

68.30–31 **68.28–29** **97.15–16** **64.22–23**

Text in SZ:

"The structure of '*in-order-to*' contains a *reference* of something to something."[61]

In the left margin, in cursive:

reference

---

[61] The Macquarrie-Robinson translation erroneously inserts a paragraph break before this sentence.

69.16–18 **69.15–16** **98.21–23** **65.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"An implement's kind of being, in which the implement shows itself of and by itself, we call *usefulness* [*Zuhandenheit*]."[62]

In the right margin, in cursive:

usefulness

69.21–23 **69.20–21** **98.27–29** **65.14–15**

Text in SZ:

"A regard that looks at things only 'theoretically' fails to understand their usefulness."

In the right margin:

But naturally a theoretical look at the implement is required if we are to grasp and have it as such objectively and to explain it descriptively.[63]

69.34 **69.33** **99.7** **65.26–27**

Text in SZ:

"Theoretical comportment is mere-looking without practical insight."

In the right margin:

What does "mere-looking" mean?

71.35–37 **71.33–35** **101.23–25** **67.18–20**

Text in SZ:

"But this already runs counter to the ontological meaning of knowing, which we have exhibited as a *founded* mode of being-in-a-world."

In the margin:

N.B.[64]

§ 16
The Worldly Character of the Lived World Manifests Itself in Inner-worldly Entities

73.23–29 **73.22–28** **103.14–20** **68.39–69.2**

Text in SZ:

"But concernful dealings encounter not just the unutilizable *within* the already useful; they also find what is lacking, both what is not 'handy' and what is not 'at hand' at all. This type of missing – viz., running across something not useful – also discovers the useful in a kind of 'just-there-

---

[62] "*Zuhandenheit*" is italicized in *SZ-1* but not in *SZ-15*.

[63] "*Aber es bedarf natürlich des theoretischen Hinsehens auf das Zeug, um es als solches gegenständlich erfassend zu haben und beschreibend zu explizieren.*"

[64] Above at *SZ* §13 (title) Heidegger claims that knowing is "a founded mode" in which being-in is "exemplified." At *SZ-1* 61.21–24 = *SZ-15* 61.20–23 = *BT-1* 88.16–19 = *BT-2* 57.22–25 Heidegger speaks of knowledge as "grounded" [*gegründet*] in being-already-with-a-world [*Schon-sein-bei-der-Welt*], and Husserl writes "founded" [*fundiert*].

ness.'[65] When we notice that something is not useful, the useful enters the mode of *obtrusiveness*."

In the right margin (the first word in cursive):

lacking
obtrusiveness

73.40–41 **73.38** **103.32** **69.12**

Text in SZ:

"[The unuseful can be encountered as] what 'stands in the way' of concern."

In the right margin, partially in cursive:

standing in the way [*im Wege liegen*]

74.9–12 **74.7–10** **104.5–9** **69.21–24**

Text in SZ:

"But with that, the useful is not simply *observed* and stared at as something just-there; the just-there that manifests itself is still bound up in the usefulness of the implement. The implement does not yet disguise itself as a mere thing."

In the left margin, in cursive:

mere things – staring

74.37–39 **74.35–36** **105.10–12** **70.6–7**

Text in SZ:

"However, in a *disturbance* of reference, in [an implement's] unutilizability for..., reference becomes explicit."

In the left margin:

Reference becomes explicit.

75.4–7 **75.3–5** **105.18–21** **70.12–15**

Text in SZ:

"The implemental matrix is lit up, not as something never seen before, but as a whole that was already and constantly seen in practical insight right from the start. But with this whole, the world manifests itself."

In the right margin:

This is no longer clear.

75.22–25 **75.20–23** **106.1–5** **70.31–35**

Text in SZ:

"The fact that the world does not 'consist' of the useful is evidenced, for example, by the following: the highlighting of the world [via conspicuousness, obtrusiveness, and obstinancy] is accompanied by an unworlding of the useful, such that just-there-ness manifests itself in the useful."

---

[65] The Macquarrie-Robinson translation omits part of this sentence.

In the right margin:

Thus just-there-ness is un-worlding.

75.26–30 **75.23–28** **106.5–10** **70.35–40**

Text in SZ:

"For the useful implement to be able to be met in its 'in-itself-ness' in everyday concern, the references and referential totalities in which practical insight is 'absorbed' must remain unthematic both for practical insight itself and above all for non-practical 'thematic' grasping."

Husserl underlines:

"remain unthematic...[for] 'thematic' grasping."

In the right margin:

Doubtless that means: a theoretically thematic [grasping]. The thematic is a practical one.[66]

75.39–41 **75.37–39** **106.21–23** **71.6–8**

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

"In an orientation focused primarily and exclusively on the just-there, the 'in-itself' can certainly not be clarified ontologically."

In the right margin:

?

followed, in the bottom left margin, by:

What kind of meaning does just-there-ness take on? [That of] mere things [had] in the corresponding external observation? But even that is not entirely understandable.

§ 17
Reference and Signs

77.3–5 **77.3–5** **107.31–33** **72.7–9**

Text in SZ:

"Again we start with the being of the useful, but this time our intention is to grasp the phenomenon of *reference* more precisely."

In the right margin:

General analysis of reference

77.8–13 **77.8–12** **107.36–108.2** **72.11–15**

Text in SZ:

"This word ['signs'] designates many things: not only [does it designate] various *kinds* of signs, but being-a-sign-for... can itself be formalized as a *universal kind of relation*, so that the sign-structure itself provides an ontological clue for a 'characterizing' of all entities whatsoever."

---

[66] "*Das meint wohl theoretisch thematisch. Die Thematik ist eine praktische.*"

In the right margin:
N.B.

79.14–16 **79.12–15** **110.8–10** **74.2–5**

Text in SZ:
"Staying with the previous example [an automobile's turn-signal], we have to say: The behavior (being) that corresponds to the encountered sign is 'giving way' or 'standing still'...."
In the right margin, partially in cursive:
Here being [is] designated as a behavior.

80.1–4 **80.1–4** **110.37–40** **74.29–32**

Text in SZ:
"A sign is not a thing that stands in an indicational relation to another thing, but *an implement that brings an implemental whole expressly into practical view such that, with all of that, the world-character of the useful is made manifest.*"
In the left margin:
N.B.

80.14–15 **80.13–14** **111.9–10** **74.42–43**

Text in SZ:
"The sign's specific character as an implement becomes especially clear in 'establishing a sign.' "
In the left margin:
establishing a sign

80.20–24 **80.19–23** **111.17–21** **75.5–9**

Text in SZ:
"Thus, practical dealings in the lived world require an available implement whose implemental character it is *to let* useful things *become conspicuous*. Therefore, the production of such implements – namely, signs – has to take their conspicuousness into consideration."
In the left margin:
Not as clear as it seems

80.35–39 **80.34–38** **111.32–36** **75.19–23**

Text in SZ:
"For example: If, in farming, the south wind is 'held' to be a sign of rain, then this 'holding,' or the value 'accruing' to this entity, is not something added on to an entity already just-there in itself – [in this case] the wind-currents and a certain geographical direction."
In the left margin, in cursive:
Objection

80.39–81.1 **80.38–81.1** **111.36–112.2** **75.23–26**

Text in SZ:

"When the south wind is taken as a mere occurrence (the way it is accessible to meteorologists, for example[67]), it is *never first of all* just-there and then only later, at certain times, invested with the function of a warning sign."

In the left margin:

Again, the same objection

81.4–11 **81.4–11** **112.5–13** **75.28–35**

Text in SZ:

"But someone will object that *whatever* is taken as a sign must first be accessible in itself and must be grasped *prior to* being established as a sign. Of course it has to be already present in one way or other. But the question is: *How* is the entity discovered in this prior encounter? As a merely-occurring thing? Or rather as an implement we still do not understand, something useful which 'we-haven't-quite-figured-out-how-to-use-yet' and which therefore still remains hidden from one's practical insight?"

In the margin:

N.B.

81.32–35 **81.31–34** **112.35–38** **76.12–15**

Text in SZ:

"One might be tempted to mention the extensive use of 'signs' in primitive Dasein – in fetishism and magic, for example – as a way of illustrating the pre-eminent role that signs play in everyday concern in the matter of understanding the world."

In the right margin:

What is the purpose of this discussion?
Primitives

82.4–6 **82.5–7** **113.6–9** **76.24–26**

Text in SZ:

"The sign itself can stand in for what it indicates not just by [occasionally] substituting for it but also by always *being* what it indicates."

In the margin:

For the objection

82.6–11 **82.7–12** **113.9–13** **76.26–31**

Text in SZ:

"But this remarkable coinciding of the sign with what it indicates does not consist in the fact that the sign-thing has already undergone a certain

---

[67] Heidegger had worked as a meteorologist during the last year of World War I.

'objectification' whereby it is experienced as a mere thing and then transposed, along with what it indicates, into the same region of being of the just-there. This 'coinciding' is not an identification of previously isolated things...."

In the left margin:

objectification
identification

82.36–83.1 **82.36–40** **113.39–114.4** **77.11–16**

Text in SZ:

"3. The sign is not just useful like other implements. Instead, in the sign's usefulness the lived world itself becomes explicitly accessible for practical insight. *A sign is an ontic useful that, as such, also functions as something indicating the ontological structure of usefulness, the referential whole, and worldhood.*

In the left margin, in cursive:

outcome

§ 18
Involvement and Significance: The Worldhood of a World

84.4–5 **84.3–4** **115.17–18** **78.18–19**

Text in SZ:

"The being-character of the useful is *involvement*."

In the left margin:

involvement

84.30–32 **84.29–31** **116.26–117.1** **78.41–43**

Text in SZ:

"The primary 'end-for-which' is a 'that-for-the-sake-of-which.' But the 'that-for-the-sake-of-which' always has to do with the being of *Dasein*, whose being is essentially concerned *about* its very being."

In the left margin:

N.B.

84.36 **84.35** **117.5** **79.3–4**

Text in SZ:

" 'Letting [something] be involved' [*Bewendenlassen*] must first be clarified...."

In the margin:

"letting [something] be involved"

85.36–38 **85.35–37** **118.18–21** **80.14–15**

Text in SZ:

"[The totality of involvements] essentially cannot be 'discovered' – if we henceforth reserve the word '*discoveredness*' [*Entdecktheit*] for a possibility-of-being of non-Dasein entities."

In the right margin, in cursive:

discoveredness

85.40–41 **85.39–40** **118.23–24** **80.17–18**

Text in SZ:

"The being of Dasein entails an understanding of being."

Husserl underlines twice:

"understanding of being"

In the right margin, underlined:

understanding of being

86.1 **85.40** **118.24–25** **80.18–19**

Text in SZ:

"Any state of understanding has its being in an act of understanding."[68]

In the left margin, in cursive:

understanding [*Verstehen*]
cf. 132[69]

86.24–27 **86.23–25** **119.19–21** **80.42–81.1**

Text in SZ (all italicized):

"The 'where' of self-referring understanding – i.e., that-in-terms-of-which entities can be encountered in the mode-of-being of 'involvement' – is, as such, the phenomenon of world."

In the left margin, in cursive:

world

87.8–9 **87.8–9** **120.12–13** **81.22–23**

Text in SZ:

"We understand the relational character of these relations of reference as *signi-fying* [*be-deuten*]."

In the right margin, in cursive:

signi-fying

---

[68] "*Verständnis hat sein Sein in einem Verstehen.*"

[69] This "132" is probably a slip of the pen for "142," the German page on which Heidegger begins his section §31 "Da-sein as Understanding." At *SZ-1* 143.12–13 = *SZ-15* 143.12–14 = *BT-1* 182.30–32 = *BT-2* 134.20–21, Heidegger writes: "Eksistent being-in-a-world is disclosed as such in the 'that-for-the-sake-of-which,' and this disclosedness has been called 'understanding.' " Then in a footnote Heidegger refers back to "§18, p. 85 ff." Husserl glosses Heidegger's sentence there with "*Verstehen.*"

87.17–18 **87.17–18** **120.23** **81.31–32**

Text in SZ:

"We call the relational character of this signifying *significance* [*Bedeutsamkeit*]."

In the right margin, in cursive:

significance

B.
The Contrast of Our Analysis of Worldhood With Descartes' Interpretation of the World

§ 19
The Definition of 'World' as *res extensa*

91.24 **91.26** **124.40** **85.29–30**

Text in SZ:

"[According to Descartes, if *corpora dura* were easily pushed], nothing would ever get touched, hardness would not be experienced and thus would also never *be*."

Husserl underlines:

and thus would also never *be*."

In the right margin:

Does Descartes say that?

§ 20
The Foundations of the Ontological Definition of "World"

93.27–36 **93.27–35** **126.28–37** **87.12–20**

Text in SZ:

"[Descartes'] evasion [of the basic question about substance] means that he leaves undiscussed the meaning of being that is entailed by the idea of substantiality, as well as the character of 'universality' belonging to this signification. To be sure, medieval ontology did not inquire into what being itself means any more than ancient ontology did. It is not surprising, therefore, if a question like that about the mode of signification of being makes no progress so long as it has to be explained on the basis of an unclarified meaning of being that the signification 'expresses.' The meaning remains unclarified because everyone takes it to be 'self-evident.' "

In the right margin:

N.B.

§ 21
Hermeneutical Discussion of the Cartesian Ontology of "World"

95.32 **95.30** **128.27** **88.41–89.2**

Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:

"Which of Dasein's kinds-of-being offers appropriate access to *those* entities whose being as *extensio* Descartes equates with the being of the 'world'?"

In the left margin, next to "of the 'world' ":

of physical nature

96.10–12 **96.10–12** **129.5–7** **89.18–21**

Text in SZ:

"...[Descartes] prescribes to the world its 'real' being on the basis of an idea of being (being = stable just-there-ness) whose origins are obscure and whose legitimacy has not been demonstrated."

Husserl underlines:

"an idea of being (being = stable just-there-ness)...legitimacy has not been demonstrated."

In the left margin:

N.B.

96.25–26 **96.24–26** **129.20–22** **89.32–34**

Text in SZ:

"[The way of grasping real entities] consists in νοεῖν, 'intuition' in the broadest sense, of which διανοεῖν, 'thinking,' is only a founded type of performance."[70]

In the margin:

N.B.

97.34–36 **97.33–35** **130.29–31** **90.35–37**

Text in SZ:

"Hardness and resistance do not show up at all unless an entity has Dasein's type of being, or at least that of a living thing."

In the right margin:

N.B.

98.3–7 **98.1–5** **130.35–39** **90.41–91.2**

Text in SZ:

"The idea of being as stable just-there-ness not only encourages an extreme definition of the being of innerworldly entities and their identification with the world in general; it likewise prevents [Descartes] from envisioning Dasein's behavior in an ontologically adequate way."

---

[70] The Macquarrie-Robinson translation incorrectly translates "...*nur eine fundierte Vollzugsform*" as: "just a more fully achieved form."

In the left margin:
N.B.

98.38–40 **98.35–37** **131.30–32** **91.30–31**
Text in SZ:
"The remaining strata of innerworldly actuality are built upon [material nature] as the fundamental stratum."
In the left margin:
N.B.

99.2–4 **99.1–3** **131.35–132.1** **91.34–36**
Text in SZ:
"Upon these qualities, which are themselves further reducible, there then stand the specific qualities, such as: beautiful, not beautiful, suitable, not suitable, useful, not useful...."
In the right margin, in cursive:
objections

99.36–40 **99.34–37** **132.33–36** **92.26–28**
Text in SZ:
"And wouldn't such a reconstruction of a use-thing – which [allegedly appears] first of all without its 'skin' – always already require *a prior positive look at the phenomenon whose totality is supposed to be produced all over again in the reconstruction*?"
In the right margin:
!

100.6–10 **100.3–6** **133.2–6** **92.35–38**
Text in SZ:
"Just as Descartes does not touch the being of substance with [his notion of] *extensio* as *proprietas*, so likewise recourse to 'value'-characteristics cannot provide even a glimpse of – much less make an ontological theme of – being as usefulness."
In the left margin:
!

100.16–17 **100.12–14** **133.12–14** **92.43–93.2**
Text in SZ:
"At the same time it is important to realize that even 'supplements' [*Ergänzungen*] to thing-ontology basically operate on the same dogmatic footing as Descartes."
Husserl underlines:
"to realize that even 'supplements' to thing-ontology"
In the left margin:
supplements!
dogmatic!

100.40–101.2 **100.38–41** **134.1–4** **93.25–29**

Text in SZ:

"In the answers to these questions the positive understanding of the *problematic* of the world will be achieved for the first time, the origin of its failure will be shown, and the legitimizing reasons for rejecting the traditional ontology of the world will be demonstrated."

Husserl underlines:

"origin of its failure" and "rejecting the traditional ontology of the world"

In the right margin at the top of p. 101:

So my phenomenology would be a traditional ontology of the world.

101.15–17 **101.13–15** **134.17–20** **94.2–4**

Text in SZ, most of it underlined by Husserl:

"Within certain limits, the analysis of *extensio* remains independent of [Descartes'] neglect of an explicit interpretation of the being of extended entities."

In the right margin:

So Heidegger has to concede that.

C. The Lived Spatiality of a Lived World[71] and Dasein's Spatiality

§ 22 The Spatiality of the Useful Within a World

101.25–27 **101.23–25** **134.26–28** **94.12–14**

Text in SZ:

"In the context of our first sketch of being-in (cf. §12) Dasein had to be contrasted with a certain way of being in space that we call 'insideness' [*Inwendigkeit*]."

In the right margin, in cursive:

insideness

102.20–21 **102.19–20** **135.22** **95.8–9**

Text in SZ:

"This means not only entities that we always encounter *first*, before any others, but also entities that are 'nearby' [*in der Nähe*]."

In the left margin, in cursive:

nearby

---

[71] "*Das Umhafte der Umwelt.*" At *SZ-15* 101.38–39 Heidegger defines "*das Umhafte der Umwelt*" as "*die spezifische Räumlichkeit des in der Umwelt begegnenden Seienden*" ("the spatiality specific to entities encountered in the lived world").

102.31 **102.31** **136.3** **95.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"The implement has its *place* [*Platz*]...."

In the left margin, in cursive:

place

103.7 **103.6** **136.22** **95.33–35**

Text in SZ:

"This 'where' (pre-envisioned by practical insight in our concernful dealings) in which implements can belong is what we call the *region*."[72]

In the right margin, in cursive:

region

103.39 **103.38** **137.19** **96.23**

Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by changing "je" to "jede" in cursive within the text.

§ 23
The Spatiality of Being-in-a-world

105.3–10 **105.3–10** **139.1–9** **97.24–31**

Text in SZ:

"By 're-moving' [*Entfernung*] – as one of Dasein's types of being *qua* being-in-a-world – we do not at all mean 'remoteness' (or 'nearness') or even 'distance.' We use 're-moving' in an active and transitive sense. It indicates one of Dasein's being-structures; 'removing something,' in the sense of putting it away, is merely one of its specific factical modes. Re-moving means abolishing the distance (or remoteness) of something: it means bringing-near."

In the margin:

re-moving = abolishing distance

106.35–38 **106.34–36** **141.15–17** **99.15–17**

Text in SZ (all italicized):

"Everyday Dasein's practical re-moving discovers the in-itself-ness of the 'true world,' the in-itself-ness of the entities that Dasein, as eksisting, is always already with."

In the left margin:

N.B.

---

[72] "*Dieses in besorgenden Umgang umsichtig vorweg im Blick gehaltene Wohin des möglichen zeughaften Hingehörens nennen wir die* Gegend." In this context, "*Gegend*" should be understood in conjection with *entgegen*: in a literalistic translation it would be the "country" of non-theoretical "encounters."

107.11 **107.9–10** **141.30** **99.27–31**

Text in SZ:

"Take someone who wears glasses that are so close in distance that they 'sit on his nose.' In this case, the implement utilized is, in terms of the lived world, more remote than the picture on the opposite wall."

Husserl underlines:

"in terms of the lived world, more remote"

In the right margin:

Is this the same concept of re-moving?

107.36–39 **107.35–37** **142.19–22** **100.11–14**

Text in SZ:

"Occupying a place must be conceived as re-moving something useful in the lived world, re-moving it into a region discovered beforehand by practical insight. Dasein discovers its 'here' in terms of the 'there' of the lived world."

In the right margin, partially in cursive:

Dasein's "here"

108.8–12 **108.6–10** **142.33–37** **100.24–27**

Text in SZ:

"Of course, Dasein can take a useful thing's re-movedness from Dasein as 'distance' if re-movedness is determined with regard to something considered as being just-there in the place Dasein previously occupied."

In the left margin:

How is that?

108.22–23 **108.19–20** **143.6–7** **100.36–37**

Text in SZ:

"As a re-moving being-in, Dasein likewise has the character of *directionality* [*Ausrichtung*]."

In the left margin:

directionality

108.35–36 **108.32–33** **143.19** **101.6–7**

Text in SZ

"Out of this directionality arise the fixed directions of right and left."

In the left margin:

fixed directions of right and left

108.37–39 **108.34–36** **143.21–23** **101.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein's spatialization *qua* 'bodiliness' (which harbors its own problematic, which we cannot treat here) is also marked out in terms of these directions."

In the left margin:
Bodiliness shunted aside

108.40–109.1 **108.36–39** **143.24–26** **101.10–12**
Text in SZ:
"Thus useful things and implements for the body – e.g., gloves, which have to move with the movements of the hands – must be oriented in terms of right and left."
In the left margin:
N.B.

§ 24
Space, and Dasein's Spatiality

110.34–35 **110.34–36** **145.17–20** **102.38–41**
Text in SZ:
"In the most immediate disclosedness [of lived space], space as the pure 'where' for measurement (for ordering points and determining locations) is not yet discovered."
In the left margin:
N.B.

111.9 **111.10** **145.36** **103.14**
Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by changing "erfindlich" to "vorfindlich" within the text.

111.13–16 **111.14–17** **146.4–7** **103.17–19**
Text in SZ:
"Letting innerworldly entities be encountered (which is constitutive for being-in-a-world) is 'allowing space.' This 'allowing space,' which we also call '*making room*' [*einräumen*], frees the useful for its spatiality."
In the right margin:
making room

111.40–41 **111.40–41** **146.31–32** **103.41–43**
Text in SZ:
"The spatiality of that which practical insight first of all encounters can itself become thematic for practical insight and a task for calculation...."
Husserl underlines:
"a task for calculation"
In the right:
How so?

112.24–27 **112.24–27** **147.18–21** **104.22–24**

Text in SZ:

"The homogenous space of nature shows up only within a certain way of discovering encountered entities, a way characterized by a specific *un-worlding* of the world-character [*Weltmäßigkeit*] of the useful."

Husserl underlines:

"specific *un-worlding* of the world-character of the useful."

In the left margin:

?

DIVISION ONE

CHAPTER FOUR
Being-in-a-world as Being-with and Being-a-self. The Everyone

114.1 **114.1** **149.17** **107.15**

Text in SZ:

"... *Who* is it that Dasein is in everydayness?"

In the left margin, in cursive:

Who

§ 25
The Approach to the Eksistential Question of the Who of Dasein

114.18–19 **114.19** **150.6** **108.5**

Text in SZ:

[The title of the section:] §25. The Approach to the Eksistential Question of the Who of Dasein

In the left margin, in cursive:

The whole §: objection

114.24–26 **114.24–26** **150.11–13** **108.9–11**

Text in SZ:

"At the same time [the definition of Dasein as 'mine'] entails the *ontic* (albeit unnuanced) claim that in each case an I, and not someone else, is this entity."

Husserl underlines:

"that in each case an 'I' "

In the left margin, in cursive:

I [*Ich*]

114.34–37 **114.33–36** **150.21–24** **108.18–21**

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

One may reject the soul-substance and deny that consciousness is a thing and that a person is an object; but ontologically one is still positing something whose being, whether explicitly or not, has the sense of just-there-ness."

In the left margin:

objection

114.36–38 **114.36–38** **150.24–26** **108.20–23**

Text in SZ:

"Substantiality is the ontological clue for delineating the entity in terms of which the question about the 'who' will be answered."

In the left margin:

N.B.

115.17–19 **115.18–20** **151.9–11** **108.42–109.1**

Text in SZ:

"Does it not contradict all the rules of sound method when the approach to a problematic fails to hold to the evident data of the thematic field?"

In the right margin:

objection[73]

115.20–23 **115.21–24** **151.12–14** **109.1–5**

Text in SZ:

"If we want to work out the givenness [of the 'I'] originally, does not this very givenness require us to prescind from all other 'givens,' including the existing 'world' and the being of any other 'I'?"

In the left margin:

N.B.

117.1 **117.3** **152.32** **110.16**

Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by changing "solche" to "solcher" within the text.

§ 26
The Co-Dasein of Others and Everyday Being-with

121.6–8 **121.5–7** **157.11–14** **113.37–39**

Text in SZ:

"Missing and 'being away' are modes of co-Dasein and are possible only because Dasein, as being-with, makes it possible to encounter the Dasein of others in its world."

---

[73] It is possible that this note applies to the entire paragraph.

In the right margin:
being-with and co-Dasein

121.8–10 **121.7–9** **157.14–15** **113.40–41**
Text in SZ:
"In each case, being-with is a determination of one's own Dasein; co-Dasein characterizes the Dasein of others...."
In the right margin:
N.B.

121.20–23 **121.19–23** **157.26–29** **114.8–11**
Text in SZ:
"*Qua* being-with, Dasein relates to entities that do not have the kind of being of useful implements: those entities are themselves Dasein. They are not an object of ordinary concern but of *concern-for-others* [*Fürsorge*]."
In the right margin, the second in cursive:
educating?[74]
concern-for-others

122.4–5 **122.3–4** **158.23–34** **114.32–33**
Text in SZ:
"As regards its positive modes, concern-for-others has two extreme possibilities."
Next to this paragraph and corresponding to the first possibility ("jumping in for"), Husserl writes in the left margin:
a) jumping in for [someone], dominating
see below

122.16 **122.15** **158.35** **115.1**
Next to this paragraph and corresponding to the second possibility, Husserl writes in the left margin:
b) going ahead [of someone], freeing

123.1–3 **123.1–3** **159.27–28** **115.25–27**
Text in SZ:
"Just as concern, as a mode of discovering the useful, entails *practical insight*, so too concern-for-others is guided by *respect* and *forbearance*."[75]
In the right margin:
practical insight, respect, forbearance[76]

---

[74] In the present context *Erziehung* seems to have the active sense of "bringing someone up."
[75] Compare συγγνώμη, *Nicomachean Ethics* VI, 11, 1143 a 23.
[76] *Umsicht, Rücksicht, Nachsicht*

124.10 124.10 161.18 116.30–33

Text in SZ:

"But since concern-for-others usually and generally maintains itself in deficient modes, or at least indifferent ones (the indifference of not noticing each other), it happens that knowing each other, in its most immediate and elementary form, requires making each other's acquaintance."

In the left margin, partially in cursive:

"requires": what does that mean?

124.22–25 124.22–25 161.31–34 117.1–4

Text in SZ:

"However, [empathy, which] seems to be the phenomenally 'first' way of understanding-and-being-with-each-other, also gets taken as what 'primordially' and originally enables and constitutes being towards others."

Husserl underlines:

"constitutes"

In the left margin, in cursive:

objection[77]

124.25–29 124.25–29 162.1–4 117.4–7

Text in SZ:

"This phenomenon, which is unfortunately designated as '*empathy*,' is then supposed to provide some kind of first ontological bridge between one's own subject, which is initially given all by itself, and the other subject, which is initially closed off to us."

In the left margin, in cursive:

?

empathy

124.35 124.35 162.10 117.11–14

Text in SZ:

"But one could say that this relationship is already constitutive of one's own Dasein, which of its-self has an understanding of being and thus relates to Dasein."

As regards the phrase:

"of its-self"

In the left margin:

of itself[78]

---

[77] This remark may apply to the preceding sentence as well.

[78] Husserl here makes a minor correction to Heidegger's German usage. In Heidegger's phrase "*von ihm selbst*" [Macquarrie-Robinson: "in its own right"], Husserl underlines the word "*ihm*" and in the left margin writes "*von sich selbst.*" Husserl's correction is difficult to bring out in English. In a very literalistic way the change might be represented as one from "of it itself" to "of itself."

124.36–38 124.36–38 162.11–14 117.14–16

Text in SZ:

"The relationship-of-being that one has towards others then becomes a 'projection' of one's being-towards-oneself 'into another.' The other is then a double of the self."

In the left margin:

?

124.39–125.3 124.39–125.4 162.15–20 117.17–22

Text in SZ:

"But it is clear that this seemingly obvious consideration rests on shaky ground. The presupposition that this argument utilizes – namely, that Dasein's being towards itself is its being towards someone else – does not hold up. Until this presupposition's legitimacy is proven evident, it will remain a puzzle how Dasein's relation to itself is supposed to be disclosed to the other as other."

Husserl glosses this text in four places:

(a) *Next to the second sentence, in the left margin:*
?

(b) *Next to the second and third sentences, in the right margin:*
?

(c) *In the second sentence he changes Heidegger's "zu ihm selbst" ["towards itself"] to "zu sich selbst."*

(d) *Next to "it will remain a puzzle," in the right margin:*
against the theory of empathy

125.17–19 125.16–18 163.1–3 117.33–35

Text in SZ:

"But the fact that 'empathy' is no more of an original eksistential phenomenon than knowledge in general is, does not mean there are no problems with regard to it."

Husserl underlines:

" 'empathy' "

In the right margin:

The supposedly genuine problem of empathy

125.30–33 125.29–31 163.14–17 118.2–4

Text in SZ:

"Coming across a quantity of subjects is itself possible only because the others whom we first meet in their co-Dasein are treated simply as 'numbers.' "

In the right margin:

?

§ 27
Everyday Being-a-self and the Everyone

126.1 **126.1** **163.28** **118.15**

Text in SZ:

[Section title:] "§27. Everyday Being-a-self and the Everyone"

In the left margin:

Also, an analysis of publicness, of life in conventionality, traditionalism

126.2–5 **126.2–5** **163.29–32** **118.17–20**

Text in SZ:

"Thè *ontologically* relevant result of the previous analysis of being-with is the insight that the 'subject-character' of one's own Dasein and of others is determined eksistentially, in terms of certain ways of being."

In the left margin:

?

126.14–15 **126.14–15** **164.4–6** **118.28–29**

Text in SZ:

"Expressed eksistentially, [being-with-each-other] has the character of *distantiality* [*Abständigkeit*]."

In the left margin, in cursive:

distantiality [79]

126.31 **126.31–32** **164.21–22** **119.1**

Text in SZ:

"The 'who' is the neuter: *the Everyone* [*das Man*]."

In the left margin, in cursive:

Everyone

127.6–8 **127.6–8** **164.37–39** **119.15–17**

Text in SZ:

"The tendency of being-with that we earlier called distantiality, is grounded in the fact that being-with-each-other, as such, concerns itself with *averageness*."

In the right margin:

averageness

127.9 **127.8–9** **164.39–40** **119.17**

Text in SZ:

"[Averageness] is an eksistential character of the Everyone."

Husserl underlines:

"eksistential character of the Everyone"

---

[79] Husserl's note may be keyed to the entire paragraph.

In the left margin:
What does this mean?

127.17–19 127.17–19 165.10–11 119.26–27
Text in SZ:
"The care of averageness in turn reveals an essential tendency of Dasein that we call the *leveling down* of all possibilities-of-being."
In the right margin:
leveling down of all possibilities-of-being

128.32–34 128.31–33 166.26–28 120.33–34
Text in SZ:
"On the contrary, working out the concepts of being must be oriented in accordance with these unavoidable phenomena."[80]
In the left margin:
N.B.

129.14–16 129.14–15 167.11–13 121.10–11
Text in SZ:
"The self of everyday Dasein is the *Everyone-self*, which we distinguish from the *authentic* (i.e., properly apprehended) *self*."
In the right margin, partially in cursive:
Everyone-self and authentic self

130.1–5 130.1–4 168.5–9 121.35–38
Text in SZ:
"Everyday Dasein draws the pre-ontological explication of its being from the most immediate type of being, that of Everyone. Ontological interpretation initially follows the lines of this explication: it understands Dasein in terms of the world and takes Dasein as an innerwordly entity."
In the left margin:
for the objection[81]

130.12–13 130.12–13 168.18–19 122.1–4
Text in SZ:
"And so, by exhibiting this positive phenomenon – i.e., the most immediate everyday being-in-a-world – we can gain an insight into why an ontological interpretation of this state of being has been lacking."
Husserl underlines:
"insight into why an ontological interpretation of this state of being has been lacking."
In the left margin:
?

---

[80] Husserl underlines all of this, and much of the previous, sentence.
[81] *"Zum Einwand"*

DIVISION ONE

CHAPTER FIVE
Being-in as such

§ 28
The Task of a Thematic Analysis of Being-in

131.24–26 **131.23–26** **170.2–3** **124.6–9**

Text in SZ:

"What we have presented so far would need to be filled out in various ways with regard to a complete elaboration of the eksistential *a priori* [required] for a philosophical anthropology."

In the right margin:

philosophical anthropology

132.1–2 **132.1–2** **170.16–17** **124.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"In which direction should one look for the phenomenal characterization of being-in?"

In the left margin, in cursive:

objection[82]

132.13 **132.13** **170.27–28** **124.31–32**

Text in SZ:

"...*Dasein is the being* of this 'between.' "

In the left margin:

For the objection[83]

133.3–13 **133.1–10** **171.17–26** **125.18–27**

Text in SZ:

"In talking about the ontic image of the *lumen naturale*, we are referring to nothing less than the eksistential-ontological structure of [Dasein] – the fact that it *is* in such a way as to be its own 'openness.' It is 'illumined,' which is to say: cleared in itself *as* being-in-a-world – not through some other entity but in such a way that it itself *is* the clearing.[84] Only for an eksistential entity that is cleared in this way does the just-there become accessible in the light and hidden in the dark. By nature Dasein comes with its own 'openness'; if Dasein lacked that, factically it

---

[82] Husserl's remark appears at the very beginning of the paragraph and presumably applies to more than the first sentence.

[83] Husserl's remark "*Zum Einwand*" might apply to the preceding and following sentences as well as to present one.

[84] "*Lichtung*": At this point Heidegger's word "*Lichtung*" carries the metaphoric sense of "clearing" rather than that of "lighting."

would not be the entity that has this essence; indeed, it would not be at all. *Dasein is its disclosedness.*"

In the right margin, in cursive:

clearing
350 (section 69)[85]

A. The Eksistential Constitution of the "Open"

§ 29
Da-sein as Disposition

134.9–11 **134.8–10** **172.26–28** **126.28–29**

Text in SZ:

"What we indicate *ontologically* by the term 'disposition' is *ontically* the most familiar, everyday sort of thing: mood, being in a mood."

In the left margin, in cursive:

disposition
mood

134.22–24 **134.21–23** **173.12–13** **126.40–127.2**

Text in SZ:

"...Dasein becomes satiated with itself. Being has become manifest as a burden. Why, one does not *know*."

In the left margin:

Is this really a concrete interpretation?[86]

134.39–135.8 **134.40–135.8** **173.31–174.5** **127.16–24**

Text in SZ:

"The fact that Dasein ordinarily does not 'submit' to such moods, i.e., does not follow up their disclosure and let itself face what Everyone discloses, is not evidence *against* (in fact, it is evidence for) the phenomenal fact that moods disclose the being of the 'open' in its 'fact-that-it-is.' *Ontically*-eksistentielly, Dasein mostly evades the being that is disclosed in the mood; *ontologically*-eksistentially this means that [even] in issues to which the mood pays no heed, Dasein is revealed in its being-delivered-over to the 'open.' Even in evasion, the 'open' *is* a disclosed 'open.' "

In the right margin of p. 135:

How can Heidegger know all of this, when even the one who has the mood knows nothing about it?

---

[85] The reference is to the first paragraph of §69, which begins at *SZ-1* 350.28 = *SZ-15* 350.27 = *BT-1* 401.32 = *BT-2* 321.25. Heidegger has a footnote there referring back to the present passage.

[86] Husserl's remark may apply to the rest of the paragraph as well.

135.10–12 **135.10–12** **174.6–8** **127.26–28**

Text in SZ:

"...this 'fact-that-it-is' is what we call this entity's *thrownness* into its 'openness' such that, as being-in-a-world, it is the 'open.' "

In the right margin, in cursive:

thrownness

135.20–23 **135.20–22** **174.17–19** **127.35–37**

Text in SZ, the entire sentence italicized by Heidegger:

"Facticity is not the factuality of the *factum brutum* of the just-there, but a characteristic of Dasein's being, one that is assumed into eksistence, even though mostly shunted aside."

In the right margin, the first word in cursive:

facticity of being-delivered-over

136.1–6 **136.1–5** **175.4–9** **128.14–18**

Text in SZ:

"Even if Dasein is 'secure' in its belief about where it came from, or thinks it is rationally enlighted in knowing where it is going, none of this holds up against the phenomenal fact that this mood confronts Dasein with the 'fact-that-it-is' of its 'openness,' which as such stares it in the face with the inexorability of an enigma."

In the left margin:

?

137.1–4 **137.1–3** **176.5–7** **129.7–8**

Text in SZ, all italicized by Heidegger:

"Mood has always already disclosed being-in-a-world as a whole and first makes possible directing-oneself-towards...."

In the left margin:

Is this so clear and certain, just as it stands?

137.7–10 **137.6–9** **176.11–13** **129.12–14**

Text in SZ:

"Because [disposition] itself is essentially being-in-a-world, it is an eksistential basic-form of the *co-original disclosedness* of world, of co-Dasein, and of eksistence."

In the right margin:

?

137.11–15 **137.10–14** **176.14–18** **129.15–19**

Text in SZ:

"Besides the two essential characteristics of disposition that we have explained – its disclosure of thrownness and its disclosure (in each instance) of being-in-a-world as a whole – we should note a *third* character-

istic, which especially contributes to a stronger understanding of the worldhood of the world."

In the right margin:

?

137.19–22 **137.18–20** **176.23–25** **129.23–25**

Text in SZ:

"From the viewpoint of disposition, we now see more clearly that a practical, concerned allowing-things-to-be-met has the character of being-affected [*Betroffenwerden*]."

In the right margin:

being-affected

137.26–28 **137.24–26** **176.30–32** **129.29–31**

Text in SZ:

"This ability-to-be-affected is grounded in disposition *qua* having disclosed the world as (to take one example) possibly threatening."[87]

In the right margin:

N.B.

137.28 **137.26** **176.33** **129.31–32**

Text in SZ:

"Only something that is in the disposition of fear or fearlessness..."

In the text Husserl writes in cursive "wer" ["someone who"] above "was" ["something that"].

137.32–35 **137.30–33** **176.37–177.3** **129.36–39**

Text in SZ:

"Only because the 'senses' belong ontologically to an entity whose type of being is a disposed being-in-a-world, can the senses be 'stirred by' and 'have a sense for' [something] in such a way that what stirs them shows up in an affect [*Affektion*]."

In the right margin, the first word in cursive:

affect and disposition[88]

137.39–138.4 **137.37–138.3** **177.9–12** **129.43–130.3**

Text in SZ:

"*Eksistentially, disposition entails a disclosive dependence upon the world that lets us encounter what affects us. Ontologically* and in principle we have to attribute the primary discovering of the world to 'mere mood.' "

---

[87] "*Diese Angänglichkeit gründet in der Befindlichkeit, als welche die Welt z.B. auf Bedrohbarkeit hin erschlossen hat.*" In *SZ-15*, but not in *SZ-1*, a "*sie*" appears after "*welche*."

[88] Husserl's remark might cover the next two sentences as well. The word "*Affektion*" ["affect"] here seems to have the sense of the Latin *affectio*: "the state of being affected by something."

In the left margin of p. 138:
N.B.

138.12–22 **138.11–20** **177.21–30** **130.11–20**
Text in SZ:
Husserl brackets the text from "It is precisely when we see the 'world' unsteadily and fitfully" to "tarrying alongside..., in ῥᾳστώνη and διαγωγή."
In the left margin:
For the objections

139.31–33 **139.29–31** **179.1–3** **131.20–22**
Text in SZ:
"Like any ontological interpretation generally, this [analysis] can only 'eavesdrop' on an already previously disclosed entity, with attention to its being."
In the left margin:
N.B.

140.1–4 **140.1–3** **179.5–7** **131.24–26**
Text in SZ:
"Phenomenological interpretation must bestow on Dasein itself the possibility of original disclosure and, as it were, let [Dasein] interpret itself."
In the left margin:
N.B.

140.40 **140.8** **179.10** **131.30**
Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by changing the "39" in "(Cf. §39)" to "40," in the left margin.

§ 30
Fear as a Mode of Disposition

140.11 **140.11** **179.16** **131.34**
At the beginning of the section, in the left margin:
341[89]

140.25–26 **140.25–26** **179.31** **132.8–9**
Text in SZ:
"1. What we encounter has harmfulness [*Abträglichkeit*] as its kind of involvement."

---

[89] Heidegger's footnote at *SZ-1* 341.7 = *SZ-15* 341.7 = *BT-1* 391.8 = *BT-2* 313.28 refers back to this section.

In the left margin:

What is this harmfulness?

141.6–9 **141.7–10** **180.14–16** **132.28–31**

Text in SZ:

"One does not first ascertain an approaching evil (*malum futurum*) and then fear it. But neither does fear first note that something is approaching; rather, before anything else, it uncovers something in its fearfulness."

In the right margin a large:

N.B.

141.35–36 **141.36–37** **181.10–11** **133.13–14**

Text in SZ:

"Fear-about can also be related to other people, and in that case we speak of 'fearing for' them."

In the right margin, in cursive:

fearing for

§ 31
Da-sein as Understanding

143.2 **143.3** **182.19** **134.13–15**

Text in SZ:

"On the other hand, 'understanding' in the sense of *one* possible type of knowledge among others..."

Husserl underlines:

"in the sense"

In the right margin, underscored:

(in the usual sense)

143.12–13 **143.12–14** **182.30–32** **134.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"Eksistent being-in-a-world is disclosed as such in the 'that-for-the-sake-of-which,' and this disclosedness has been called 'understanding.' "[90]

In the right margin, in cursive:

understanding[91]

143.21–23 **143.20–22** **183.1–3** **134.31**

Text in SZ:

"In ontic discourse we sometimes use the expression 'to understand something' as meaning 'to be able to manage something,' 'to be up to it,' 'to-be-able-to-do [*können*] something.' "

---

[90] Heidegger has a footnote here: "Cf. 18, pp. 85 ff." See our next footnote.

[91] See the note above at *SZ-1* 86.1 = *SZ-15* 85.40 = *BT-1* 118.24–25 = *BT-2* 80.18–19.

In the right margin, partially in cursive:
Dasein's possibility, and being-able-to-do

144.5–14 144.5–14 183.26–35 135.11–19
Text in SZ:
[The entire paragraph, i.e., from "Possibility, as an eksistentiale, does not signify some ungrounded ability-to-be" to "Its being-possible is transparent to itself in different possible ways and degrees."]
In the left margin next to the entire paragraph:
N.B.

144.28–31 144.28–31 184.15–17 135.34–36
Text in SZ, all italicized by Heidegger:
"Understanding is the eksistential being of Dasein's own ability-to-be, such that this being, of and by itself, discloses 'what's up' with oneself."
In the margin:
Cf. 336[92]

145.11–13 145.11–13 184.38–185.1 136.11–12
Text in SZ:
"[Why does understanding...always press forward into possibilities?] Answer: because, in itself, understanding has the eksistential structure that we call '*projection.*' "
In the right margin, in cursive:
projection

146.1–4 146.1–4 186.6–9 137.1–4
Text in SZ:
"Projection always covers the full disclosedness of being-in-a-world; as an ability-to-be, understanding itself has possibilities, and they are pre-indicated by the range of what is essentially disclosable in it."
Husserl underlines:
"as an ability-to-be, understanding itself has possibilities"
In the left margin:
This is not yet completely clear.

146.8–13 146.8–13 186.13–18 137.8–12
Text in SZ:
"Understanding is either authentic (i.e., arises out of one's own self as such) or inauthentic. The 'in-' [of 'inauthentic'] does not mean that Dasein prescinds from its self and understands 'only' the world. As be-

[92] Twice at *SZ* p. 336 (which is the first page of §68a, "The Temporality of Understanding") Husserl refers back to this page: see *SZ-1* 336.2 = *SZ-15* 336.2 = *BT-1* 385.11 = *BT-2* 309.14, and *SZ-1* 336.11–13 = *SZ-15* 336.11–12 = *BT-1* 385.21–23 = *BT-2* 309.23–25.

ing-in-a-world, being-a-self always entails a world. In turn, both authentic and inauthentic understanding *can* be either genuine or not genuine."

In the left margin:

authentic and inauthentic understanding. Intersecting with them: genuine - not genuine

146.25–26 **146.23–24** **186.28–29** **137.23–24**

Text in SZ:

"In its projective character, understanding goes to make up eksistentially what we call 'Dasein's sight.' "

In the left margin, the second word in cursive:

Dasein's sight

146.30–33 **146.28–31** **186.35–37** **137.29–31**

Text in SZ:

"The sight that is usually and generally related to eksistence we call '*insight-into-oneself* [*Durchsichtigkeit*]' We choose this term to designate a correctly understood 'self-knowledge'..."

In the left margin, the first word in cursive:

insight-into-oneself = self-knowledge

146.37–40 **146.35–38** **187.4–8** **137.34–37**

Text in SZ:

"An eksistent entity 'sights itself' only insofar as, along with its being-present-to the world and its being-with others as constitutive moments of its eksistence, it also co-originally has achieved insight-into-itself."

In the left margin:

Yes, but does that mean: to enter-the-theoretical-attitude transcendentally-phenomenologically?

147.9–11 **147.6–8** **187.17–19** **138.5–8**

Text in SZ:

"The only property of [ordinary] sight that we claim for our ekistential meaning of sight is this: sight allows any accessible entity to be met unconcealedly in itself."

Husserl underlines:

"entity" [with a double underscoring] and "allows...to be met unconcealedly"

In the left margin:

namely, Dasein[93]

[93] It seems that Husserl misreads Heidegger here. Heidegger is saying that sight allows a separate entity to be encountered. Husserl seems to identify the encountered entity exclusively with Dasein.

147.19–23 **147.16–19** **187.26–30** **138.14–18**

Text in SZ:

"By having shown how all sight is grounded primarily in understanding (the practical insight of concern is understanding as *common sense*) we have deprived pure intuition of its priority, a priority that corresponds noetically to the traditional ontological priority of the just-there."

In the right margin, in cursive:

objection

§ 32
Understanding and Explication

148.24 **148.21–22** **188.31–32** **139.18–19**

Text in SZ:

"We call the development of understanding *explication* [*Auslegung*]."

In the left margin:

explication

150.15 **150.14** **191.10** **140.42**

Text in SZ:

"In each case this [explication] is grounded in a *fore-having*."

In the left margin, in cursive:

fore-having

150.20–22 **150.18–20** **191.16–19** **141.4–6**

Text in SZ:

"In each case explication is grounded in a *fore-sight* that 'broaches' what one has taken in the already-having in terms of a specific possibility of interpretation."

In the left margin, in cursive:

fore-sight

150.24–26 **150.22–25** **191.21–24** **141.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"The explication either can draw its concepts from the very entity that is to be explicated, or it can force [the entity] into concepts opposed to it and its type of being."

In the left margin, in cursive:

interpretation – fore-conception

151.23–25 **151.22–24** **192.35–37** **141.44–142.2**

Text in SZ:

"When innerworldly entities are discovered along with the being of Dasein (i.e., come to be understood), we say they have meaning [*Sinn*]."

In the right margin, in cursive:
meaning
cf. 324[94]

152.34–36 **152.31–32** **194.19–20** **143.6–7**

Text in SZ:
"Yet according to the most elementary rules of logic, this *circle* is a *circulus vitiosus* [a vicious circle]."
In the left margin, in cursive:
circle[95]

§ 33
Assertion as a Derivative Mode of Explication

155.19–21 **155.17–19** **197.17–20** **145.23–25**

Text in SZ:
" 'Assertion' means '*communication*,' expressing [something]. As communication, it has a direct relation to 'assertion' in the first and second significations above. It is showing-to [someone] that which we pointed out in determining it."
In the right margin:
N.B.

155.37–40 **155.35–38** **198.5–8** **145.41–146.1**

Text in SZ:
"Here we need not provide a long discussion of the currently dominant theory of 'judgment' that is oriented to the phenomenon of 'validity.' It is sufficient that we allude to the fact that this phenomenon of 'validity' is quite questionable...."
In the right margin, the last word in cursive:
Critique of the doctrine of validity

158.23–27 **158.22–26** **201.8–11** **148.19–23**

Text in SZ:
"Thus assertion cannot disown its ontological origin within an understanding explication. We call the original 'as' of a practical-understanding-explication (ἑρμηνεία) the eksistential-*hermeneutical* 'as' as distinct from the *apophantic* 'as' of the assertion."
In the left margin next to the entire paragraph, in cursive:
as

---

[94] Husserl is referring to *SZ-1* 324.1–7 = *SZ-15* 323.35–324.5 = *BT-1* 370.34–371.4 = *BT-2* 297.40–298.6, where Heidegger, after referring back to this passage, summarizes some of his discussion of meaning.

[95] Cf. *SZ-1* 314.22–25 = *SZ-15* 314.21–24 = *BT-1* 362.20–23 = *BT-2* 290.24–26.

158.28–36 **158.29–35** **201.12–21** **148.24–32**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph, that is, from "Between the kind of explication that is still wholly wrapped up" to "they have their 'source' in practical interpretation."]

In the left margin:

N.B.[96]

160.20–22 **160.19–21** **203.9–12** **150.9–12**

Text in SZ:

"The λόγος gets experienced and interpreted as something just-there, and the entity it indicates likewise gets the meaning of just-there-ness."

In the left margin:

N.B.

§ 34
Da-sein and Discursiveness. Language

161.6–7 **161.7–8** **203.36–204.1** **150.35**

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

"Discursiveness is the articulation of intelligibility."

In the left margin:

understood actively, no doubt[97]

161.13–14 **161.13–14** **204.8–9** **151.2–3**

Text in SZ:

"If discursiveness – the articulation of the intelligibility of the 'open' – is an original *eksistential* of disclosedness..."

In the right margin:

?

163.24–26 **163.24–26** **206.30–33** **153.9–12**

Text in SZ:

"Hearing, in fact, constitutes Dasein's primary and authentic openness for its ownmost ability-to-be – something like the hearing of the voice of the friend whom every Dasein carries with itself."

In the right margin:

?

---

[96] Husserl's remark may apply more to the latter half of the paragraph.

[97] It seems Husserl's comment relates to the word "articulation."

163.27–29 **163.26–29** **206.33–35** **153.12–14**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein hears because it understands. As understandingly being-in-a-world with others, [Dasein] longs to 'hear' (and, in this longing, be-longs to) co-Dasein and to itself."

In the right margin:

contrived

163.29–32 **163.29–32** **206.36–207.2** **153.14–17**

Text in SZ:

"Being-with is developed in listening-to-each-other, which can take the forms of 'following,' going along with, [and] the rudimentary forms of not-hearing, resisting, defying, and turning away."

In the right margin:

?

165.12–14 **165.12–14** **208.29–32** **154.33–35**

Text in SZ:

"Since discursiveness is constitutive for the being of the 'open' (that is, for disposition and understanding), and since 'Dasein' means being-in-a-world, Dasein as discursive being-in has already expressed itself."

In the right margin:

paradox

165.39–41 **165.38–41** **209.14–16** **155.19–22**

Text in SZ:

"The task of *liberating* grammar from logic requires *beforehand* a *positive* understanding of the basic *a priori* structure of discursiveness in general as an *eksistential*..."

In the left margin:

N.B.

167.19 **167.19** **210.33** **156.33**

Following the errata list (see above), Husserl corrects SZ by writing "aus" in cursive within the text after "von ihr."

B.
The Everyday Being of the "Open"
and
Dasein's Falling

§ 35
Chatter

168.25–26 **168.27–28** **212.14–15** **157.41–42**

Text in SZ:

"Communication does not 'impart' the primary relation-of-being-to the entity under discussion..."

Husserl underlines:

"the primary relation-of-being-to the entity under discussion"

In the left margin:

constituting the originally self-giving origin?

§ 36
Curiosity

170.21 **170.22** **214.23** **159.32**

In the margin next to the section title:

344[98]

172.25–32 **172.25–31** **216.29–36** **161.22–161.28**

Text in SZ:

"When freed-up, curiosity concerns itself with seeing, not in order to understand the seen (i.e., to attain a being-towards it) but *merely* in order to see. It seeks out the new only in order to jump from it anew to something else that is new. What matters for the care that goes with this seeing is not grasping something and being cognitively in the truth but, instead, the possibilities of abandoning itself to the world. Therefore, curiosity is characterized by a specific form of *not-staying-around* what is most immediate."

In the left margin:

Is all of this an eidetic necessity?

---

[98] Husserl may have mistakenly written "344" when he meant to write "346." At *SZ-1* 346.24–25 = *SZ-15* 346.24–25 = *BT-1* 397.11–12 = *BT-2* 318.11–12 Heidegger has a footnote that refers back to the present section and Husserl writes in the left margin "curiosity."

§ 38
Fallenness and Thrownness

177.39–41 **177.39–41** **222.14–16** **166.14–16**

Text in SZ:

"However, this tranquillity in inauthentic being does not seduce one into stagnation and inactivity, but drives one into unrestrained 'bustle.' "

In the left margin, in cursive:

bustle

DIVISION ONE

CHAPTER SIX
Care as Dasein's Being

§ 39
The Question of the Original Wholeness of Dasein's Structural Whole

183.36–38 **183.36–38** **228.19–20** **172.10–12**

Text in SZ:

"Therefore, adequately preparing the being-question requires the ontological clarification of the phenomenon of *truth*."

In the right margin:

truth

§ 40
The Basic Disposition of Dread as a Distinctive Form of Dasein's Disclosedness

184.10 **184.10** **228.33** **172.23**

At the beginning of the section, in the left margin:

342[99]

185.21–23 **185.20–22** **230.7–8** **173.35–37**

Text in SZ:

"We are not entirely unprepared for the analysis of dread. But it is still obscure how dread is connected ontologically with fear."

In the right margin, the first and last words in cursive:

dread in contrast to fear

---

[99] It seems Husserl is referring ahead to *SZ-1* 342.32–33 = *SZ-15* 342.31–32 = *BT-1* 393.2–3 = *BT-2* 315.1–2, where a footnote refers back to this section.

§ 41
Dasein's Being as Care

192.1 **191.38** **236.14** **179.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"But living into one's ownmost ability-to-be means, ontologically, that Dasein is always already *ahead* of itself in its being."

In the left margin, in cursive:

ahead

194.3 **194.3** **238.20** **181.3–4**

Text in SZ:

"Willing and wishing are rooted, with ontological necessity, in Dasein as care..."

In the left margin, in cursive:

willing, wishing

195.10–11 **195.10–11** **239.30–32** **182.8–9**

Text in SZ:

"In that case, being towards possibilities shows up mostly as mere *wishing*."

In the right margin:

wishing

195.25 **195.25** **240.6** **182.22**

Text in SZ:

[At the head of the paragraph beginning "In hankering..."]

In the right margin, in cursive:

addiction and urge

§ 43
Dasein, Worldhood, and Reality

200.25–26 **200.24–25** **244.34–35** **186.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"The question of the meaning of being becomes possible at all only if there *is* some sort of understanding of being."

In the left margin, in cursive:

objection

A. Reality as a Problem of Being and of Whether the "External World" Can Be Proven

202.35–37 **202.35–37** **246.39–247.2** **188.24–26**

Text in SZ:

"The question 'Is there a world at all, and can its being be proven?' – as a question that *Dasein* as being-in-a-world might ask (and who else might ask it?) – makes no sense."

In the left margin:

?

202.37–40 **202.37–203.2** **247.2–5** **188.26–29**

Text in SZ:

"Moreover, [the question] is burdened with an ambiguity. World as the 'where' of being-in and 'world' in the sense of innerworldly entities (the 'that-with-which' of concerned absorption) are confused, or at least not distinguished."

In the left margin:

N.B.

In the right margin:

?

207.9–11 **207.8–11** **250.37–251.2** **192.5–9**

Text in SZ:

"Nor is such a *basis* to be obtained by subsequent phenomenological improvements of the concepts of subject and consciousness. Such a procedure could not prevent an inappropriate *formulation of the question* from continuing on."

In the right margin:[100]

?

207.13–16 **207.12–15** **251.3–6** **192.10–13**

Text in SZ:

"Along with Dasein as being-in-a-world, innerworldly entities have always already been disclosed. This eksistential-ontological assertion seems to accord with *realism's* thesis that the external world really is just-there."

In the right margin:

Heidegger's realism

207.23–25 **207.22–24** **251.14–15** **192.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"Indeed, [realism] tries to explain reality ontically by real effective interconnections among real things."

---

[100] Husserl's question mark might be directed to the previous sentence in *SZ* as well.

In the right margin:

?

207.41–208.1 207.40–208.1 251.31–32 192.35–38

Text in SZ:

"Only because being is 'in consciousness' – i.e., understandable in Dasein – can Dasein also understand and conceptualize such characteristics of being as independence, the 'in-itself,' and reality in general."

Husserl underlines:

"understand" and "conceptualize"

In the left margin of p. 208:

Doesn't constitutive phenomenology show that?

208.12–13 208.10–12 252.1–2 193.5–9

Text in SZ:

"But if 'idealism' means reducing all entities to a subject or a consciousness whose only distinction is to remain *underdetermined* in its being and at best negatively characterized as 'un-thing-like,' then this idealism is methodologically no less naïve than the crudest of realisms."

In the left margin, next to the main clause:

!

B. Reality as an Ontological Problem

209.17–19 209.17–19 252.33 193.39–194.1

Text in SZ:

"To be sure, the reality of the real can be given a phenomenological characterization within certain limits without any explicit eksistential-ontological basis."

In the right margin:

?

210.17–18 210.17–18 253.28–30 194.33–34

Text in SZ:

"[The ontological fundamental analysis of 'life'] supports and conditions the analysis of reality, the whole explanation of resistance and its phenomenal presuppositions."

In the left margin:

the resistance theory of reality

211.13–21 211.13–20 254.18–26 195.19–26

Text in SZ:

[Husserl makes three remarks pertaining to this paragraph.]

Husserl's first remark:

In the left margin, and apparently referring to the entire paragraph:

cogito, Descartes

Husserl's second remark:

211.13–15 211.13–15 254.18–20 195.19–21

Text in SZ:

"If the "*cogito sum*" is to serve as the starting point of the eksistential analysis of Dasein, then it needs both to be inverted and to undergo a new ontologico-phenomenal confirmation of its contents."

In the right margin:

N.B.

Husserl's third remark:

211.16–21 211.15–20 254.20–26 195.21–26

Text in SZ:

"The first assertion, then, is: 'I am' – specifically in the sense of 'I-am-in-a-world.' As being in this way, 'I am' in the possibility-of-being towards certain comportments (*cogitationes*) as ways of being with innerworldly entities. But Descartes, on the contrary, says *cogitationes* are just-there and that, along with them, the ego is likewise just-there as a worldless *res cogitans*."

In the right margin, a large:

?

C. Reality and Care

211. 23–24 211.22–23 254.28–29 195.28–29

Text in SZ:

"'Reality,' as an ontological term, is related to innerworldly entities."

In the right margin, in cursive:

reality

211.28–29 211.27–28 254.34 195.33–35

Text in SZ:

"The 'nature' that 'surrounds' us is, of course, innerworldly entities, but it shows the type of being not of the just-there nor of the useful in the form of 'things of nature.' "

In the right margin:

nature that surrounds us

211.31–34 211.31–34 254.36–40 195.35–38

Text in SZ:

"Whatever way this being of 'nature' may be interpreted, *all* the modes of being of innerworldly entities are founded ontologically upon the world-

hood of a world, and accordingly upon the phenomenon of being-in-a-world."

In the margin:

Cf. 311[101]

212.1–3 **211.39–212.3** **255.7–9** **196.3–5**

Text in SZ:

"But the fact that reality is ontologically grounded in the being of Dasein, cannot signify that the real is able to be what it is in itself only if and as long as Dasein eksists."

In the left margin:

? N.B.

212.4–6 **212.4–7** **255.10–14** **196.6–9**

Text in SZ:

"Of course, being is 'given' only as long as Dasein (i.e., the ontic possibility of an understanding of being) *is*. If Dasein does not eksist, then there 'is' no 'independence' and there 'is' no 'in-itself' either."

In the left margin:

So things in themselves are left in abeyance.

212.17–21 **212.17–21** **255.24–28** **196.19–23**

Text in SZ:

"Only an orientation to an eksistentiality that is interpreted ontologically and *positively* can prevent any (even undifferentiated) meaning of reality from being taken as foundational during the actual process of analyzing 'consciousness' or 'life.' "

In the left margin:

objection

212.24–25 **212.24** **255.30–31** **196.24–26**

Text in SZ:

"The fact that entities with Dasein's type of being cannot be conceived in terms of reality and substantiality has been expressed by our thesis that *the substance of human being is eksistence*."

Husserl underlines:

"the substance of human being is eksistence."

In the left margin:

?

---

[101] It would seem that Husserl here mistakenly wrote "311" when he meant "318." At *SZ-1* 318.8–10 = *SZ-15* 318.6–8 = *BT-1* 365.40–-366.1 = *BT-2* 293.23–25 Heidegger has a footnote referring back to this page and section, and in the margin at that point Husserl has written "N.B. 211."

§ 44
Dasein, Disclosedness, and Truth

B. The Original Phenomenon of Truth and the Derivative Character of the Traditional Conception of Truth

222.17–18 222.16–17 265.4–5 204.25

Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:

"To the degree that Dasein is disclosed, it is also closed off..."

In the left margin:

Clever, but self-evident once it is correctly reduced.[102]

225.6–9 225.6–9 267.35–39 206.41–207.1

Text in SZ:

"The eksistential phenomenon of discoveredness, founded on the Dasein's disclosedness, becomes a just-there property that still preserves a relational character, and as such it gets fragmented into a just-there relationship."

In the right margin:

N.B.

225.26–29 225.26–29 268.20–24 207.19–22

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

"But because [just-there-ness] has been equated with the meaning of being in general, it is not *possible* even to ask whether this form of the being of truth, along with its directly encountered structures, is original or not."

In the right margin:

And the method of constitutive phenomenology!?

226.6–8 226.5–7 268.38–269.2 207.36–38

Text in SZ:

"And because Aristotle never asserted the aforementioned thesis, he likewise was never in a position to 'broaden' the conception of the truth of λόγος to include pure νοεῖν."

Husserl underlines:

"to 'broaden' the conception of the truth of λόγος to include pure νοεῖν."

In the left margin:

N.B.

---

[102] By "reduced" [*reduziert*], Husserl may mean something like "deflated" or "cut down to size."

C. The Type of Being of Truth, and the Presuppositions of Truth

226.31–32 226.29 269.21–22 208.15–16

Text in SZ, all italicized by Heidegger:

" There 'is' truth only insofar as, and as long as, Dasein is."

In the left margin:

N.B.

227.11–13 227.11–13 269.40–270.2 208.32–34

Text in SZ:

"That there are eternal 'truths' will not be adequately proven until someone has succeeded in demonstrating that Dasein was and will be for all eternity."

In the right margin, the first word in cursive:

eternal truths

230.21–23 230.17–20 273.5–7 211.24–26

Text in SZ:

"By freeing up the phenomenon of care, we have clarified the being-structure of the entity whose being entails some understanding of being."

Husserl underlines:

"clarified"

In the left margin:

?

230.25–28 230.22–24 273.10–13 211.28–31

Text in SZ:

"We have elucidated understanding itself and thereby also guaranteed the methodological clarity of our understanding-explicative procedure for interpreting being."

Husserl underlines:

"methodological clarity"

In the left margin:

?

DIVISION TWO
DASEIN AND TEMPORALITY

§ 45
The Outcome of the Preparatory Fundamental Analysis of Dasein, and the Task of an Original Eksistential Interpretation of this Entity

231.34–37 **231.33–36** **275.1–3** **214.8–9**

Text in SZ:

"In fact, what does *originality* mean with regard to an ontological interpretation?

Ontological investigation is one possible kind of explication..."

In the right margin, in cursive:

N.B.
re method

232.3–4 **232.4–5** **275.7–8** **214.14–15**

Text in SZ:

"...the whole of these 'presuppositions,' which we call the 'hermeneutical situation,'..."

In the left margin, in cursive:

hermeneutical situation

232.25–27 **232.24–26** **275.31–33** **214.36–38**

Text in SZ:

"Did the eksistential analysis of Dasein that we performed arise from the kind of hermeneutical situation that will guarantee the originality required by fundamental ontology?"

In the left margin:

Did it arise there?

DIVISION TWO

CHAPTER ONE
The Possible Wholeness of Dasein and Being-at-the-point-of-death[103]

§ 47
The Possibility of Experiencing the Death of Others, and the Possibility of Grasping the Whole of Dasein

237.30–33 **237.29–32** **281.13–16** **221.9–12**

Text in SZ:

"The attainment of the whole of Dasein in death is simultaneously the loss of the being of the 'open.' The transition to no-longer-Dasein takes Dasein right out of the possibility of experiencing this transition and understanding it as experienced."

In the left margin:

So the question: How can I make that intuitional?

§ 50
Preliminary Sketch of the Eksistential-ontological Structure of Death

250.38–41 **250.38–40** **294.25–27** **232.23–24**

Text in SZ:

"Death is the possibility of the absolute impossibility of Dasein. Thus *death* is revealed to be *one's ownmost, exclusive, and inevitable possibility.*"

In the left margin:

?

The possibility of death is thereby always presupposed, not clarified.

Continuing in the margin at the bottom of the page:

Another inevitable possibility is universal chance, fate, the universum of irrationality.

251.7–10 **251.7–10** **295.3–6** **232.31–34**

Text in SZ:

"This ownmost, exclusive, and inevitable possibility is not one that Dasein procures for itself, subsequently and occasionally, in the course of

[103] Husserl makes no marginal comments in §§ 46, 48–49, and 51.

its being. On the contrary, if Dasein eksists, it has also already been *thrown* into this possibility."

In the right margin:

N.B.

251.13–16 251.13–16 295.9–13 232.36–39

Text in SZ:

"Thrownness into death is revealed to [Dasein] more originally and strikingly in the disposition of dread. Dread in the face of death is dread 'in the face of' one's ownmost, exclusive, and inevitable ability-to-be."

In the right margin:

Instinct of dread, and must be revealed as such.

§ 52
Everyday Being-unto-the-end, and the Full Eksistential Conception of Death

258.4–9 258.4–8 302.8–13 238.21–27

Text in SZ:

"With the everyday disposition characterized above (the 'anxiously' concerned but seemingly dread-less superiority to the certain 'fact' of death), everydayness acknowledges a certainty that is 'higher' than merely empirical certainty. One *knows* death is certain, yet one 'is' not authentically certain about one's own death."

Husserl underlines:

" 'higher' than merely empirical certainty."

In the left margin:

Then certainty is not merely doxic certainty.

258.22–25 258.22–25 302.26–28 238.39–41

Text in SZ:

"Thus the Everyone covers up what is peculiar about the certainty of death – *the fact that death is possible at any moment.* Along with the certainty of death goes the *indefiniteness* of its 'when.' "

Husserl underlines:

"death's certainty – *that it is possible at any moment*"

In the left margin:

But here, precisely in phenomenological terms, something else comes into consideration. Death is intertwined with chance and, in general, with the "contingency" of the duration of one's life.

§ 53
Eksistential Projection of an Authentic Being-at-the-point-of-death

261.31–40 **261.28–38** **305.37–306.7** **241.28–39**

Text in SZ:

[Husserl brackets from "This is the way one comports oneself when one thinks about 'death' " to "...we must put up with *it* as a possibility, *in the way we comport ourselves towards it."]*

In the right margin:

N.B.

262.17–18 **262.15–16** **306.25–26** **242.13–14**

Text in SZ:

"The phrase we use for being unto possibility is *anticipation of possibility.*"

In the left margin, in cursive:

anticipation[104]
336[105]

264.38–41 **264.38–41** **309.21–24** **244.27–31**

Text in SZ:

"[The certainty of death] is absolutely not a truth about something just-there that is best uncovered and encountered in simple observational acts of letting-an-entity-be-encountered-in-itself."

Husserl underlines:

"just-there"

In the left margin:

N.B.

264.41–265.7 **264.41–265.7** **309.24–30** **244.31–36**

Text in SZ:

"To achieve the pure issue-orientedness (i.e., indifference) of apodictic evidence, Dasein has to have first lost itself in the state of affairs (and this can be one of care's own tasks and possibilities). The fact that being-certain about death does not have this character does not mean it is on a lower level than [apodictic certainty]; *it does not even belong on the scale of kinds of evidence about the just-there.*"

In the left margin of p. 265, next to the whole of the last sentence, a large:

N.B.

---

[104] Husserl's downward-pointing arrow here in the margin may indicate that this word and the "336" that follows apply to the entire paragraph.

[105] At *SZ-1* 336.36–37 = *SZ-15* 336.36–37 = *BT-1* 386.11–12 = *BT-2* 310.5–6 Husserl refers back to this page.

265.19–22 **265.19–22** **310.7–11** **245.4–7**

Text in SZ:

"[The way one grasps the ego and consciousness] cannot in principle hold *for true* (for disclosed) what it wants basically to 'have-just-there' as true: the Dasein that (as an ability-to-be) I *am* and can authentically be only via anticipation."

In the right margin:

N.B.

265.29–31 **265.29–31** **310.18–20** **245.14–15**

Text in SZ:

"In anticipating its indefinite but certain death, Dasein opens itself to a constant *threat* arising out of its own 'openness.' "

In the right margin:

N.B.

266.30–32 **266.29–31** **311.19–21** **246.6–10**

Text in SZ:

"Without proposing to [Dasein] any eksistentially ideal 'content' or imposing it from 'without,' [our eksistential sketch of anticipation] has allowed Dasein to project itself, as it were, in terms of this possibility."

In the left margin:

N.B.

DIVISION TWO

CHAPTER TWO

How Dasein Gives Evidence of an Authentic Ability-to-be; Resoluteness

§ 54
The Problem of How an Authentic Eksistentiel Possibility Evidences Itself

268.1–5 **268.1–5** **312.21–25** **247.18–248.3**

Text in SZ:

"[Dasein's] lostness in the Everyone entails that decisions have always already been made about Dasein's most immediate factical abilities-to-be (i.e., about the tasks, rules, and standards, the urgency and extent, of being-in-a-world *qua* concern and concern-for-others). Grasping these being-possibilities has always already been preempted from Dasein by Everyone."

In the left margin:

Obviously that holds for the "tradition."

268.14–17 **268.13–16** **313.1–4** **248.10–13**

Text in SZ:

"Pulling oneself back from Everyone – i.e., eksistentielly modifying the Everyone-self into *authentic* selfhood – must be carried out as the *retrieval of a choice*."

Husserl underlines:

"*retrieval of a choice*."

In the left margin:

What kind of choice?

268.17–20 **268.16–19** **313.5–8** **248.13–17**

Text in SZ:

"Retrieving a choice means *making that choice*, deciding for an ability-to-be in terms of one's own self. In making the choice, Dasein first *makes possible* for itself its authentic ability-to-be."

Husserl underlines:

"in terms of one's own self"

In the left margin:

This can take place even in the Everyone. But precisely one's "own self" is in question.

I would place the problem of justification in the forefront.[106]

269.2–4 **269.2–4** **313.28–29** **248.37–39**

Text in SZ:

"The ontological analysis of conscience on which we are thus embarking lies prior to any description and classification of experiences of conscience...."

In the right margin:

N.B.

269.11–13 **269.11–13** **313.36–37** **249.5–6**

Text in SZ:

"As a phenomenon of Dasein, conscience is not some occasional, just-there fact that just happens."

In the right margin:

Happens for whom? For the one who "has" it.

269.24 **269.24** **314.8** **249.17**

Text in SZ:

"Conscience lets 'something' be understood; it *discloses*."

In the right margin:

Yes, it is an intentionality.

---

[106] This last sentence might be meant to apply to the following paragraph in *SZ*.

§ 55
The Eksistential-ontological Foundations of Conscience

271.9–10 **271.10–11** **316.6–7** **250.34–35**

Text in SZ:

"The call [of conscience] shatters Dasein's deafness to itself and its listening to Everyone... ."

Husserl underlines:

"Everyone"

In the right margin:

Why merely to Everyone?

271.14–16 **271.14–16** **316.11–14** **251.4–6**

Text in SZ:

"...[Conscience] calls without noise, without ambiguity, giving no grounds for curiosity. *This kind of call, which lets us understand, is conscience.*"

In the left margin:

Thus conscience [is] essentially related to the Everyone.

In the right margin:

?

271.38–272.2 **271.38–272.3** **317.7–9** **251.26–29**

Text in SZ:

"A phenomenon like conscience strikingly reveals the ontological-anthropological inadequacy of any ungrounded framework of classified mental faculties or personal acts."

Husserl underlines (SZ-1 271.39):

"ungrounded"

In the right margin of p. 271:

x[107]

273.12–16 **273.15–19** **318.1–5** **252.22–26**

Text in SZ:

"The Everyone-self is summoned before the court of the self. This latter is not the self that can turn itself into an 'object' of judgment; it is not the self whose 'inner life' can be endlessly dissected by busy curiosity, nor the self that is found by 'analytically' staring at one's mental states and what lies behind them."

In the right margin:

x[108]

---

[107] Husserl refers to this passage on the front endpaper of his copy (see above) where he writes "ungrounded classifying" and "[p.] 271."

[108] Husserl refers to this passage on the front endpaper of his copy (see above) where he writes "staring" and "[p.] 273."

§ 57
Conscience as the Call of Care

278.10–14 **278.10–14** **323.10–13** **256.34–38**

Text in SZ:

"Why look to alien powers for information before having made sure that, at the very outset of the analysis, we have not *under*estimated Dasein's being, taking it as a harmless subject, endowed with personal consciousness, which somehow or other happens to occur?"

Underlined:

"*under-*" and "taking it as a harmless subject, endowed with personal consciousness, which somehow or other happens to occur"

In the left margin:

!! N.B.[109]

§ 58
Understanding the Appeal, and Guilt

284.3–6 **284.5–7** **329.29–31** **262.4–6**

Text in SZ:

"This implies, however, that *being-guilty does not first result from an indebtedness; on the contrary, indebtedness becomes possible only on the 'basis' of an original being-guilty.*"

In the left margin:

Again, the inversion[110]

284.24–29 **284.25–30** **330.13–17** **262.22–26**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph, from "And how is *Dasein this thrown basis?" to "that ability-to-be that is the issue for care."]*

In the left margin, a large:

?

284.32–35 **284.33–36** **330.20–23** **262.29–32**

Text in SZ:

"Thus, being-[a-thrown]-ground means that, from that ground up, one *never* has power over one's ownmost being. This '*not*' belongs to the ek-sistential meaning of 'thrownness.' As a [thrown] ground, Dasein itself *is* its own 'not-ness.' "[111]

---

[109] Husserl refers to this passage on the front endpaper of his copy (see above) where he writes: "Critical ...[p.] 278."

[110] Cf. below, *SZ-1* 339.19–20 = *SZ-15* 339.18–20 = *BT-1* 389.5–6 = *BT-2* 312.9–10, and *SZ-1* 339.26–29 = *SZ-15* 339.25–27 = *BT-1* 389.11–14 = *BT-2* 312.16–18.

[111] "*...[ist] eine Nichtigkeit seiner selbst.*"

In the left margin:
not-ness

284.36–41 284.36–285.2 330.23–28 262.32–36

Text in SZ:
" 'Not-ness' does not mean anything like not-being-just-there or not-subsisting; rather, it refers to the 'not' that constitutes Dasein's very *being*: its thrownness. The 'not'-character of this 'not'[112] is eksistentially determined as follows: In being a *self*, Dasein is the thrown entity *as* a self. [Dasein is a self] *not of and by itself* but only because it has been turned over to itself by its ground in order that it might *be* this [thrown ground]."

In the left margin, a large:
?

285.5–11 285.6–12 331.3–10 262.41–263.4

Text in SZ:
"Dasein is its ground by eksisting, i.e., in such a way that it understands itself in terms of possibilities and, by doing so, is the thrown entity. But this implies that, *qua* ability-to-be, Dasein always stands in one possibility as contrasted with another: it constantly is *not* the other possibility and has waived it in its eksistentiel projection. As thrown, projection is determined by the not-ness of being-a-[thrown]-ground; and *as projection,* it is essentially *fraught-with-negativity* [*nichtig*]."

In the right margin, a large:
?

and the comment:
Is a presentation like this possible?

285.18–34 285.19–34 331.17–32 263.10–23

Text in SZ:
[Husserl brackets these two paragraphs, from "In the structure of thrownness" to "if it made sufficient progress."]

In the right margin:
!

285.35–36 285.35–36 331.33–34 263.24–25

Text in SZ:
"Nonetheless, the *ontological meaning of the essence* of this eksistential not-ness is still obscure."

Husserl underlines:
"obscure"

In the left margin, in cursive:
yes

---

[112] *"Die Nichtcharakter dieses Nicht...."*

285.36–37 **285.36–37** **331.34–35** **263.25–26**

Text in SZ:

"But this holds as well for the *ontological essence of the 'not' in general.*"

In the right margin, in cursive:

the not [*Nicht*]

286.5–11 **286.5–10** **332.5–9** **263.32–37**

Text in SZ:

"Has anyone ever problematized the *ontological source* of notness, or even *before that*, sought just the *conditions* for being able to raise the problem of the 'not,' its notness, and the possibility of notness? And how else are these conditions to be found *except via the thematic clarification of the meaning of being in general?*"

In the left margin:

N.B.

287.10–14 **287.9–12** **333.10–14** **264.31–34**

Text in SZ:

"Conscience, in calling Dasein back [to itself] by calling it forward [to itself], lets Dasein understand that Dasein itself (the negatived ground of its negatived projection, standing in the possibility of its being) must bring itself back to itself from its lostness in Everyone. In a word, conscience makes Dasein understand that it *is guilty*."

In the left margin:

N.B.

287.35–41 **287.33–39** **333.34–334.4** **265.10–16**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph, from "Hearing the appeal correctly" to "It has chosen itself."]

In the left margin:

?

288.7–8 **288.7–8** **334.12** **265.24**

Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:

"Understanding the call is choosing... ."

In the left margin, in cursive:

choosing

288.10–11 **288.10–11** **334.14–15** **265.27–28**

Text in SZ:

" '*Understanding-the-appeal*' means: *wanting-to-have-a-conscience*."

In the left margin:

?

288.24–26 **288.24–26** **334.27–29** **265.39–41**

Text in SZ:

"[Taking-action is conscienceless] because, on the negatived basis of its negatived projection, it has, in being with others, already become guilty towards them."

In the left margin:

?

288.31–33 **288.31–33** **334.34–36** **266.3–5**

Text in SZ:

"Thus conscience manifests itself as a form of *giving evidence* that belongs to Dasein's being, one in which Dasein's being calls Dasein to face its ownmost ability-to-be."[113]

In the left margin:

N.B.

288.40–298.1 **288.40–289.1** **335.8–9** **266.13–14**

Text in SZ:

"Can the phenomenon of conscience, as it 'really' is, still be recognized at all in the interpretation we have given here?"

In the left margin of p. 288, in cursive:

yes

§ 59
The Eksistential Interpretation of Conscience, and the Ordinary Construal of Conscience

289.21–23 **289.21–23** **335.31–33** **266.34–36**

Text in SZ:

"But why *must* the ontological interpretation agree with the ordinary interpretation at all? Should not the latter, in principle, be the subject of ontological suspicion?"

In the right margin:

?

289.36–38 **289.36–38** **336.9–11** **267.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"Two things follow from [the ordinary experience of conscience]: on the one hand, the everyday construal of conscience cannot be accepted as the final criterion for the 'objectivity' of an ontological analysis."

In the left margin:

!

---

[113] The subject of the last clause (*es*) could equally be construed as referring to *das Gewissen* (conscience) rather than to *das Sein des Daseins*.

290.11–19 **290.13–20** **336.25–33** **267.23–34**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph, from "In this ordinary interpretation there are four objections" to "and that which 'warns.' "]

In the left margin:

The 4 characteristics of the ordinary construal of conscience refuted one after the other.

293.5–8 **293.5–8** **339.17–20** **270.7–9**

Text in SZ:

"But this gives rise to a twofold covering-up of the phenomenon: This [ordinary] theory [of conscience] envisions a sequence of lived experiences or 'mental processes' whose kind of being is for the most part quite undetermined."

In the right margin:

objection[114]

293.25 **293.24** **339.37** **270.25**

Text in SZ:

"Consequently the further objection loses its force...."

In the text, Husserl underlines "further" and above it writes:

4th[115]

293.36–39 **293.35–38** **340.9–12** **270.35–38**

Text in SZ:

"As if Dasein were a 'family unit' whose forms of indebtedness simply needed to be balanced out in an orderly manner so that the self, like a disinterested spectator, could stand 'in the margins' of these experiences as they run their course!"

In the left margin:

N.B.

294.11–14 **294.10–12** **340.26–28** **271.8–10**

Text in SZ:

"We miss the call's 'positive' content *if we expect to find some presently relevant information on available, calculable, assured possibilities for 'taking action.'* "

In the left margin:

N.B.

---

[114] In the right margin Husserl writes the letter "E" for the German "*Einwand*," "objection."

[115] Husserl is thereby indicating that this "further" objection is the "fourth" one listed at *SZ-1* 290.17–19 = *SZ-15* 290.18–20 = *BT-1* 336.31–33 = *BT-2* 267.32–34.

294.14–16 **294.12–15** **340.28–31** **271.10–13**

Text in SZ:

"This expectation is grounded in the horizon of explication used by common-sense concern, which forces Dasein's eksistence to fit the notion of a rule-bound business procedure."

Husserl underlines:

"rule-bound business procedure"

In the left margin:

?

294.17–19 **294.15–17** **340.32–33** **271.13–15**

Text in SZ:

"Such expectations, which in part underlie even the demand for a *material* ethics of value as contrasted with a 'merely' formal one,..."

Husserl notes this passage above by writing "[p.] 294" on the book's front endpaper.

§ 60
The Eksistential Structure of the Authentic Ability-to-be that is Evidenced in Conscience

295.27–32 **295.25–30** **342.5–10** **272.21–26**

Text in SZ:

"[Wanting-to-have-a-conscience means] letting one's ownmost self act upon itself from out of itself *qua* being-guilty; phenomenally speaking, this is Dasein's authentic ability-to-be evidencing itself in Dasein. We now have to lay out its eksistential structure. This is the only way to get to the basic structure of the *authenticity* of Dasein's eksistence as disclosed in Dasein itself."

In the left margin:

N.B.

296.2–5 **296.2–5** **342.22–24** **272.37–39**

Text in SZ:

"The fact of the *dread of conscience* gives us phenomenal confirmation that in understanding the call Dasein is brought face to face with its own uncanniness."

In the left margin:

?

297.1–3 **297.1–2** **343.20–21** **273.31–32**

Text in SZ:

"*...the silent ready-for-dread self-projection in terms of one's ownmost being-guilty* is what we call *resolution.*"

After the word "resolution," within the text:
(authentic), see below[116]
In the top margin, just above this text:
Is "resolution," in the natural meaning of the word, [the same as] decision?

297.4–6 **297.3–5** **343.22–24** **273.33–35**
Text in SZ:
"Resolution is a distinctive mode of Dasein's disclosedness. But in an earlier passage disclosedness was interpreted eksistentially as *original truth*."
In the right margin, in cursive:
resolution and original truth

297, n.1 **297, n.1** **496, n.x** **410, n.12**
Text of Heidegger's footnote to the previous passage:
Cf. §44, 212 ff.
Beneath "212 ff." Husserl writes:
220/21.[117]

297.15–19 **297.14–17** **343.32–35** **273.43–274.2**
Text in SZ:
"The disclosedness of the 'open' discloses, just as originally, the whole of its being-in-a-world – that is: the world, being-in, and the self that this entity, as an 'I am,' is."
In the right margin:
N.B.[118]

297.35–38 **297.33–36** **344.16–19** **274.19–21**
Text in SZ:
"However, this *authentic* disclosedness co-originally modifies the discoveredness of the 'world' (this discoveredness is founded in disclosedness) as well as the co-Dasein of others."
In the right margin:
authentic resolution[119]

---

[116] Husserl's gloss "authentic" presumably applies to "disclosedness" ("authentic resoluteness" is a pleonasm). The phrase "see below" presumably refers to *SZ-1* 297.35–38 = *SZ-15* 297.33–36 = *BT-1* 344.16–19 = *BT-2* 274.19–21, where Heidegger declares authentic disclosedness to be a modification of discoveredness and of the disclosedness of co-Dasein.

[117] This entry is to be taken with the previous one. For the notion that disclosedness is original truth, Heidegger refers the reader to §44 globally (the section begins on p. 212), whereas Husserl's "220/21" specifies the reference to *SZ-1* 220.38–-221.1 = *SZ-15* 220.37–221.1 = *BT-1* 263.25–27 = *BT-2* 203.17–19: "Discoveredness happens *with* and *through* [disclosedness]; hence, only with the Dasein's *disclosedness* do we reach the *original* phenomenon of truth."

[118] A downward-pointing arrow indicates that this remark may apply to the following sentences as well.

298.12–15 **298.11–14** **344.33–36** **274.34–37**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein's resolution regarding itself first makes it possible to let other co-existing Daseins 'be' in their ownmost ability-to-be; and it lets their ability-to-be be co-disclosed in that concern-for-others that goes ahead of and frees [them]."

In the left margin:

Has this been clarified?

298.15–18 **298.14–17** **344.36–39** **274.38–40**

Text in SZ:

"Resolute Dasein can become the 'conscience' of others. From the authentic selfhood of resolution first comes authentic togetherness...."

In the left margin:

N.B.

299.22–25 **299.22–24** **346.8–11** **275.37–39**

Text in SZ:

"The eksistential delineation of any possible resolute Dasein includes the constitutive items of the heretofore passed-over eksistential phenomenon that we call '*situation.*' "

In the right margin, in cursive:

situation

Under that:

Why is situation related exclusively to "authenticity"?

300.1–3 **299.39–300.2** **346.25–27** **276.9–11**

Text in SZ:

"Far removed from any just-there mixture of circumstances and accidents that one might encounter, situation *is* only in and through resolution."

In the left margin:

N.B.

300.6–7 **300.4–6** **346.30–32** **276.14–15**

Text in SZ:

[*Taking "ac-cidents" etymologically as what "be-falls" one:*] "In the social, lived world, what we call ac-cidents can *be-fall* only resolution."

In the right margin, in cursive:

accident

In the left margin:

Is this the concept of accident?!

---

[119] Cf. above, Husserl's first comment at *SZ-1* 297.1–3 = *SZ-15* 297.1–2 = *BT-1* 343.20–21 = *BT-2* 273.31–32.

300.28–30 **300.26–28** **347.21–22** **276.37–38**

Text in SZ:

"This phenomenon that we have set forth under the title 'resolution' can hardly be confused with an empty '*habitus*' or an indefinite 'velleity.' "

In the left margin:

objection[120]

301.5–8 **301.3–6** **348.8–10** **277.10–13**

Text in SZ:

"Presenting the factical eksistentiel possibilities [of resolution] in their chief features and interconnections, and interpreting them according to their eksistential structure, are among the tasks of a thematic eksistential anthropology."

In the right margin, in cursive:

eksistential anthropology

301, note 1 **301, note 1** **496, note xv** **410, note 17**

Text in SZ:

[Heidegger's footnote, keyed to the previous entry, mentions Karl Jaspers' Psychologie der Weltanschauungen *and its treatment of worldviews and of the eksistential-ontological meaning of "limit situations."]*

In the right margin of p. 301, next to the footnote:

N.B.

301.16–17 **301.14–15** **348.19–20** **277.21–22**

Text in SZ:

"From what we have seen so far, Dasein's authenticity is neither an empty term nor some fabricated idea."

In the right margin:

Authenticity [is] not a "fabricated idea."

301.20–23 **301.17–20** **348.22–26** **277.25–27**

Text in SZ:

"Only when this [evidencing/*Bezeugung*] has been found does our investigation adequately exhibit (as its problematic requires) an eksistentially confirmed and clarified authentic ability-to-be-whole on Dasein's part."

In the right margin, in cursive:

On method

301.23–27 **301.20–24** **348.27–30** **277.27–31**

Text in SZ:

"Only when this entity has become phenomenally accessible in its authenticity and wholeness does the question of the meaning of the being

---

[120] In the margin Husserl writes the letter "E" for the German "*Einwand*."

of *this* entity, to whose eksistence an understanding of being belongs as such, attain a genuine base."

In the right margin:

?

DIVISION TWO

CHAPTER THREE
Dasein's Authentic Ability-to-be-whole and Temporality as the Ontological Meaning of Care

§ 61
A Preliminary Sketch of the Methodological Step from the Delimitation of Dasein's Authentic Wholeness to the Phenomenal Exposition of Temporality

302.30–33 **302.29–32** **350.7–10** **280.14–17**

Text in SZ:

"As long as our eksistential interpretation does not forget that the entity it takes as its theme has *Dasein's* kind of being and cannot be pieced together, out of just-there fragments, into something just-there... ."

In the left margin:

Time and again, attacks the just-there, [and] piecing together

303.6–14 **303.7–15** **350.21–28** **280.26–32**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph, from "In taking this step" to "may be impelled the more keenly."]

In the right margin, the first word in cursive:

Method of eksistential interpretation

304.16–18 **304.16–18** **352.6–8** **281.30–32**

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

"So we should not be surprised if, at first glance, temporality does not correspond to what is accessible to ordinary understanding as 'time.' "

In the left margin:

N.B.[121]

[121] A downward-pointing arrow may indicate that this comment applies to the rest of the paragraph as well.

§ 62
Dasein's Eksistentielly Authentic Ability-to-be-whole as Anticipatory Resolution

306, note 1 **306, note 1** **496, note ii** **411, note 2**

Text in SZ:

"The eksistential analysis of being-guilty proves nothing either *for* or *against* the possibility of sin. In a strict sense we cannot even say the ontology of Dasein *of itself* leaves this possibility open, insofar as [this ontology], as a philosophical inquiry, in principle 'knows' nothing about sin."

In the left margin:

N.B. ?[122]

307.1–5 **307.1–5** **354.24–28** **283.33–37**

Text in SZ:

"Understanding the call of conscience reveals that one is lost in Everyone. Resolution pulls Dasein back to its ownmost ability-to-be-itself. When we understand that being-at-the-point-of-death is our *ownmost* ability-to-be, that ability becomes thoroughly and authentically clear."

In the right margin:

N.B.

307.6–9 **307.6–9** **354.29–32** **283.38–41**

Text in SZ:

"In its appeal, the call of conscience bypasses all of Dasein's 'worldly' prestige and abilities. Relentlessly it individuates Dasein down to its ability-to-be-guilty and demands that Dasein *be* this ability."

In the right margin:

always a theological-ethical discourse

310.15–17 **310.14–16** **358.5–7** **286.30–32**

Text in SZ:

"Along with the sober dread that brings us face to face with our individuated ability-to-be, there goes an unshakable joy in this possibility."

In the left margin, partly in cursive:

unshakable joy

---

[122] On the front endpaper of *SZ-1* Husserl apparently refers ahead to this footnote when he writes "306."

310.23–26 **310.22–24** **358.12–14** **286.37–39**

Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:

"Is there not, however, a definite ontic conception of authentic eksistence, a factical ideal of Dasein, underlying our ontological interpretation of Dasein's eksistence? Yes, there is."

In the left margin:

N.B.

310.29–33 **310.27–31** **358.17–22** **286.41–287.3**

Text in SZ:

"Philosophy will never try to deny its 'presuppositions,' but neither may it simply admit them. It conceptualizes its presuppositions and submits them, and what they are presuppositions for, to a more rigorous development. The methodological reflections now required of us have this very function."

In the left margin, quite large:

? ?

§ 63
The Hermeneutical Situation Thus Far Achieved for Interpreting the Meaning of the Being of Care; and the Methodological Character of the Eksistential Analysis in General

310.34–36 **310.32–34** **358.23–25** **287.5–7**

Text in SZ:

[The section-title of §63, above]

In the left margin, in cursive:

method

311.31–312.11 **311.30–312.11** **359.25–360.2** **288.1–19**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph, from "Dasein's kind of being" to "as the questions themselves demand."]

In the right margin of p. 311, in cursive:

method N.B.[123]

312.17–19 **312.17–19** **360.8–10** **288.25–27**

Text in SZ:

"Every ontic understanding has its 'inclusions,' even if these are only *pre*-ontological – i.e., not theoretically-thematically conceptualized."

Husserl underlines:

" 'inclusions' "

[123] With downward-pointing arrows, Husserl indicates that these remarks apply to the entire paragraph.

In the left margin, in cursive:
implication

312.22–24 **312.22–24** **360.13–15** **288.30–32**
Text in SZ:
"Yet where are we to find out what makes up the 'authentic' eksistence of Dasein? Without an eksistentiel understanding, all analysis of eksistentiality remains groundless."
In the left margin:
N.B.

313.27–41 **313.27–41** **361.18–34** **289.28–290.3**
Text in SZ:
[The entire paragraph, from "In indicating the formal aspects" to "not binding from an eksistentiel point of view."]
In the right margin:
The guiding idea and the procedure guided by it

314.22–25 **314.21–24** **362.20–23** **290.24–26**
Text in SZ:
"In analyzing the structure of understanding in general, we have already shown that what gets censured inappropriately as a 'circle' belongs to the essence and distinctive character of understanding as such."
In the left margin, in cursive:
charge of circularity[124]

315.11–15 **315.10–14** **363.8–11** **291.4–8**
Text in SZ:
"Originally constituted by [care], Dasein is always already ahead-of-itself. By being, it has already been projected in terms of certain possibilities of its eksistence and, in such eksistentiel projections, has pre-ontologically co-projected some sort of eksistence and being."
In the right margin:
But this presupposes his theory.

315.25–27 **315.24–26** **363.21–23** **291.17–20**
Text in SZ:
"The distinctive thing about common sense is that it wants to experience only 'factual' entities so that it can rid itself of an understanding of being."
In the left margin:
?

[124] Cf. *SZ-1* 152.34–36 = *SZ-15* 152.31–32 = *BT-1* 194.19–20 = *BT-2* 143.6–7.

315.30–32 **315. 26–31** **363.23–28** **291.20–24**

Text in SZ:

"[Common sense] fails to see that entities can be experienced 'factually' only when being has already been understood, if not conceptualized. Common sense misunderstands understanding. And *therefore* it must, of necessity, brand as 'violent' anything that lies beyond, or attempts to exceed, the scope of its understanding."

In the right margin, a large:

?

316.1–3 **316.1** **363.36–37** **291.32–35**

Text in SZ:

"One presupposes not too much but *too little* for the ontology of Dasein if one 'sets out' from a worldless 'I' and then tries to provide it with an object and with an ontologically groundless relation to that object."

In the left margin of p. 316, in cursive:

objection[125]

"worldless I"

§ 64
Care and Selfhood

317.3–5 **317.3–4** **364.33–34** **292.25–27**

Text in SZ:

"Even though it is *articulated*, the care-structure does not first arise from cobbling [other structures] together."

In the right margin, in cursive:

yes, exactly

317.31–34 **317.28–31** **365.25–28** **293.10–13**

Text in SZ:

"The 'I' seems to 'hold together' the wholeness of the structural whole. In the 'ontology' of this entity, the 'I' and the 'self' have always been conceived as the supporting ground (whether as substance or subject)."

In the right margin, in cursive:

I

self

318.3–6 **318.1–4** **365.35–37** **293.19–21**

Text in SZ:

"...if the self belongs to the essential determinations of Dasein – whose 'essence,' however, consists in *eksistence* – then I-hood and selfhood must be conceived *eksistentially*."

---

[125] A bracket in the margin may indicate that this word applies to the rest of the paragraph as well.

In the left margin:

which, however, is questionable from the beginning.[126]

318.8–10 **318.6–8** **365.40–366.1** **293.23–25**

Text in SZ:

"It has become clear in principle that, ontologically, care is not to be derived from reality or to be built up with the categories of reality."[127]

In the left margin:

N.B.
211[128]

318.17–19 **318.14–16** **366.8–10** **293.31–33**

Text in SZ:

"Clarification of the eksistentiality of the self has its 'natural' starting point in Dasein's everyday self-interpretation, where Dasein, in *saying 'I,'* expresses itself about 'itself.' "

In the left margin, in cursive:

I

319.16–17 **319.11–13** **366.40–41** **294.25–26**

Text in SZ:

"The 'I think' is the form of apperception, which belongs to and precedes every experience."

In the right margin, in cursive:

Kant's "I think"

319.28–30 **319.25–27** **367.10–12** **294.36–38**

Text in SZ:

"Accordingly the *subjectum* is 'consciousness in itself,' not any representation but rather the 'form' of any representation."

In the right margin:

What is meant here by representation, consciousness?

320.5–8 **320.3–5** **367.24–26** **295.11–13**

Text in SZ:

"The ontological concept of the subject [in Kant] delineates *not the selfhood of the 'I'* qua *self, but the selfsameness and stability of something always already just-there.*"

---

[126] Husserl seems to be questioning that Dasein's essence consists in its eksistence. Cf. above *SZ-1* 42.16 = *SZ-15* 42.16 = *BT-1* 67.21 = *BT-2* 40.1, where Heidegger writes: "Dasein's 'essence' consists in its eksistence." Husserl glosses the sentence with "Cf. 313f.," which presumably is a *lapsus* for "318f."

[127] Heidegger places a footnote here: "Cf. §43 c, p. 211."

[128] This seems to be the sentence indicated by the marginal note at *SZ-1* 211.31–34 = *SZ-15* 211.31–34 = *BT-1* 254.36–40 = *BT-2* 195.34–38. Cf. the previous footnote.

In the left margin:

?

But it hovers [between the two].

321.1–3 320.9–321.1 367.29–31 295.16–18

Text in SZ:

"But why is it that Kant is unable to exploit ontologically his genuine phenomenal starting point in the 'I think' and instead has to fall back on the 'subject,' i.e., the substantial?"

In the right margin:

Must "substantial" take on the usual meaning of "substance"?

321.17–18 321.15–17 368.5–6 295.33–34

Text in SZ:

"If [the 'something' of 'I think something'] is understood as an *inner-worldly* entity, the presupposition of *world* is tacitly included with it;..."

In the right margin:

This need not be correct simply as it stands.

322.1–3 322.1–3 368.24–27 296.10–12

Text in SZ:

"What is the motive for this 'fleeing' way of saying 'I'? Answer: Dasein's fallenness, in which it *flees* in the face of itself into the Everyone. The 'natural' discourse of the 'I' is performed by the Everyone."

In the left margin:

?!

322.8–12 322.8–12 368.32–37 296.17–21

Text in SZ:

"Even though 'natural' ontic 'I'-discourse overlooks the phenomenal content of the Dasein intended in the 'I,' the ontological interpretation of the 'I' still has *no right* to *cooperate in overlooking it* or to force the problematic of the self into an inappropriate 'categorial' horizon."

In the left margin:

N.B.

322.17 322.16–17 369.3–4 296.25

Text in SZ:

"The 'I' refers to the entity that one is as 'being-in-a-world.' "

Husserl underlines:

"refers to" and "one"

In the left margin:

?

322.22–24 **322.21–24** **369.10–12** **296.30–32**

Text in SZ:

"The Everyone-self says 'I!' so loudly and frequently because fundamentally the Everyone-self *is not authentically* itself and evades its authentic ability-to-be."

In the left margin:

?

322.24–29 **322.24–29** **369.12–16** **296.32–37**

Text in SZ:

"Even if the ontological structure of the self cannot be traced back either to an 'I'-substance or to a 'subject'; and even if, on the contrary, the everyday-fleeing way we keep on saying 'I' must be understood in terms of our *authentic* ability-to-be, it still does not yet follow that the self is the stable, just-there ground of care."

In the left margin:

?

322.29–31 **322.29–31** **369.18–20** **296.37–39**

Text in SZ:

"Selfhood is to be found eksistentially only in the authentic ability-to-be-a-self, i.e., in the authenticity of Dasein's being as care."

In the left margin:

N.B.

323.1–3 **322.40–41** **369.29–30** **297.5–6**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein *is authentically itself* in the original individuation of silent, dread-demanding resolution."

In the right margin of p. 323, in cursive:

authentically itself

323.3–8 **322.41–323.5** **369.30–370.3** **297.6–10**

Text in SZ:

"Authentic *being*-a-self, precisely *as silent*, does not keep on saying 'I!' 'I!' Instead, in its silence it '*is*' the thrown entity that it can authentically be. The self that is revealed in the silence of resolute eksistence is the original phenomenal basis for the question about the being of the 'I.' "

In the right margin:

N.B.

§ 65
Temporality as the Ontological Meaning of Care

323.26–29 **323.23–26** **370.21–24** **297.28–31**

Text in SZ:

"In characterizing the 'connection' between care and selfhood, our aim was not only to clarify the special problem of 'I'-hood, but also to help in the final preparation for phenomenally grasping the wholeness of Dasein's structural whole."

In the right margin:

N.B.

323.28–32 **323.25–29** **370.24–27** **297.31–34**

Text in SZ:

"The *unwavering discipline* of eksistential questioning is required lest, as regards our ontological view, Dasein's kind of being be finally distorted into some kind of just-there-ness, no matter how undifferentiated."

In the right margin, in cursive:

discipline

323.37–40 **323.32–34** **370.31–33** **297.35–37**

Text in SZ:

"The exposition of the ontological meaning of Dasein's being must be carried out in an undistracted and eksistentially understanding gaze."

In the right margin:

What kind of gaze is that?

324.1–2 **323.35–324.1** **370.34–35** **297.41**

Text in SZ:

"What does '*meaning*' signify?"

In the left margin of p. 324, in cursive:

meaning[129]

324.4–7 **324.1–5** **370.37–371.4** **298.2–6**

Text in SZ:

"According to [the analysis in §32], meaning is that wherein the understandability of something subsists without being explicitly and thematically seen. 'Meaning' signifies the 'that-in-terms-of-which' of an original projection, that in terms of which something can be taken-as-what-it-is in its possibility."

In the left margin:

It is, after all, [an] intentional correlate.

---

[129] The reference above, at *SZ-1* 151.23–25 = *SZ-15* 151.22–24 = *BT-1* 192.35–37 = *BT-2* 141.44–142.2, is to this and the following sentences.

324.25–35 **324.22–32** **371.22–34** **298.22–31**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph, from "Taken strictly" to "nourishes itself," with the possible exception of the first sentence.]

In the left margin:

What complicated formalities and unclarities, simply so as not to make use of intentionality.

325.22–25 **325.19–23** **372.26–29** **299.14–16**

Text in SZ:

"[Being-at-the-point-of-death] is possible only insofar as Dasein *can* become itself *at all* in its ownmost possibility, and only insofar as, in letting itself become itself, Dasein sustains that possibility as possibility – in a word: only insofar as Dasein eksists."

In the right margin, in cursive:

sustains

325.25–27 **325.23–25** **372.29–31** **299.17–18**

Text in SZ:

"Sustaining that distinctive possibility, and letting oneself become oneself in that possibility, is the original phenomenon of be-coming."[130]

In the right margin, in cursive:

be-coming

326.18–26 **326.17–25** **374.7–16** **300.7–15**

Text in SZ:

"In *becoming* oneself and thus returning to what one *already* is, resolution enters the situation and *makes-present*. Alreadiness emerges out of becoming, such that one's already-operative (indeed, already operat*ing*) becoming bestows the present. This unified phenomenon – one's already-operative, presence-bestowing becoming – is what we call *temporality*."

In the left margin, in cursive:

temporality

327.2–3 **327.2–4** **374.32–34** **300.30–31**

Text in SZ:

"In this field of investigation, violence is not arbitrary but a necessity grounded in the issues."

In the right margin:

?

---

[130] "*Das die ausgezeichnete Möglichkeit aushaltende, in ihr sich auf sich Zukommen-lassen ist das ursprüngliche Phänomen der Zu-kunft.*" Macquarrie and Robinson translate this passage: "This letting-itself-*come-towards*-itself in that distinctive possibility which it puts up with, is the primordial phenomenon of the *future as coming towards*." Stambaugh translates it: "Letting-*come-toward-itself* that perdures the eminent possibility is the primordial phenomenon of the *future*."

328.7–10 **328.8–10** **376.11–13** **301.29–31**

Text in SZ:

"Therefore Dasein, in eksisting, can never establish itself as a just-there fact arising and passing away 'in the course of time,' with part of itself already past."

In the left margin:

And other Daseins?

328.41–329.2 **329.1–3** **377.11–14** **302.18–20**

Text in SZ:

"The phenomenon of 'towards...,' 'to...,' and 'with...' reveal temporality as the ἐκστατικόν pure and simple. *Temporality is the primordial 'outside-of-itself' in and for itself.*"

In the right margin of p. 329, in cursive:

ekstasis

329.38–330.1 **329.37–330.1** **378.20–23** **303.10–13**

Text in SZ:

"[Dasein] does not have a *finis* where it just stops; instead, it *eksists finitely*. Authentic becoming, which first unfolds the *kind* of temporality that is the meaning of anticipatory resolution, thus shows itself to be *finite*."

In the right margin of p. 329, in cursive:

finite becoming [*endliche Zukunft*]

330.12–14 **330.12–14** **378.33–379.1** **303.23–25**

Text in SZ:

"Original and authentic becoming is 'becoming-oneself,' becoming *that* self which eksists as the inevitable possibility of not-ness."

In the left margin:

N.B.

330.21–22 **330.21–22** **379.7–9** **303.30–32**

Text in SZ:

"With the thesis that temporality is originally finite, we are not disputing that 'time goes on'; we are simply holding fast to the phenomenal character of original temporality...."

In the left margin:

But what does that mean?

330.36–39 **330.34–38** **379.22–25** **304.1–4**

Text in SZ:

"But we can accomplish this clarification [of the finitude and in-finitude of time] only if we gain an adequate way of asking about finitude and infinitude. This, however, comes from an understanding look at the original phenomenon of time."

In the left margin:

Not, however, in the constitutive mode of consideration?

§ 66
Dasein's Temporality and the Task it Entails of Retrieving the Eksistential Analysis More Originally

331.27–30 **331.25–27** **380.19–20** **304.31–33**

Text in SZ:

"Demonstrating the possibility of Dasein's being-structure on the basis of temporality will go by the abbreviated (and only provisional) title of the 'temporal' interpretation."

In the right margin, in cursive:

temporal interpretation

332.6–7 **332.5–6** **380.35** **305.2–5**

Text in SZ:

"The retrieval of the earlier analysis must reveal *everydayness* in its *temporal* meaning, so that the problematic included in temporality may come to light, and the seemingly 'obvious' character of the preparatory analyses may completely disappear."

Husserl underlines:

"seemingly 'obvious' character"

In the left margin:

?

333.4–6 **333.2–4** **381.29–31** **305.37–39**

Text in SZ:

"As the entitity whose [own] being is at stake, Dasein primarily *expends itself for itself*, whether explicitly or not."

In the right margin, in cursive:

to expend itself [*sich verwenden*]

333.15–16 **333.13–14** **382.6–7** **306.5–6**

Text in SZ:

"We call the time-attribute of innerworldly entities '*within-time-ness*.' "

In the right margin, in cursive:

within-time-ness

333.25–28 **333.22–24** **382.16–18** **306.15–17**

Text in SZ:

"Working out Dasein's temporality as everydayness, historicity, and within-time-ness will provide us, for the first time, with a candid insight into the *complications* of an original ontology of Dasein."

Husserl underlines:
"insight into the *complications* of an original ontology of Dasein."
In the right margin:
?

DIVISION TWO

CHAPTER FOUR
Temporality and Everydayness

§ 67
The Basic Content of Dasein's Eksistential Structure, and a Preliminary Sketch of its Temporal Interpretation

334.14–15 334.14–15 383.12–13 307.12–13
Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:
"...in the field of ontology, any "arising-from" is degeneration."
In the left margin:
Why degeneration?

334.15–18 334.15–18 383.13–15 307.13–16
Text in SZ:
"By penetrating ontologically to the 'source,' we do not come upon something ontically obvious for 'common sense.' Instead, we open up for such understanding the questionable character of everything obvious."
In the left margin:
a variation on my teachings

334.19–21 334.19–21 383.17–19 307.17–19
Text in SZ:
"To bring back into phenomenological view the phenomena we attained in the preparatory analysis, an allusion to the stages of that analysis will have to suffice."
In the left margin, in cursive:
rec[apitulation]

334.21–23 334.21–23 383.19–21 307.19–21
Text in SZ:
"The definition of 'care' resulted from the analysis of disclosedness, which constitutes the being of the 'open.' "
In the left margin:
What is meant by "constitutes"?

§ 68
The Temporality of Disclosedness as Such

(a) The Temporality of Understanding

336.2 **336.2** **385.11** **309.14**

Text in SZ:

"With the term 'understanding'..."

In the left margin:

Cf. 144[131]

336.11–13 **336.11–12** **385.21–23** **309.23–25**

Text in SZ:

"Taken in an original eksistential sense, 'understanding' means: *to be projectively into some ability-to-be for the sake of which Dasein (at a given time) happens to eksist.*"

In the left margin:

understanding 144[132]

336.15–17 **336.14–16** **385.25–27** **309.27–28**

Text in SZ:

"However, this 'knowing' [of 'how-it-stands' with Dasein] does not mean having discovered some fact but, rather, maintaining oneself in an eksistentiel possibility."

In the left margin:

Why is it called "knowing"?

336.27 **336.26** **386.1** **309.37–40**

Text in SZ:

"Projection, which basically has to do with becoming, does not, in the first instance, thematically grasp the projected possibility by having-it-in-mind. Rather, it throws itself into it as a possibility."

In the left margin:

Doubtless for Heidegger having-in-mind is intentionality.

336.36–37 **336.36–37** **386.11–12** **310.5–6**

Text in SZ:

"The term we have reserved for designating authentic becoming is '*anticipation.*' "

In the left margin:

262[133]

---

[131] Above at *SZ-1* 144.28–31 = *SZ-15* 144.28–31 = *BT-1* 184.15–17 = *BT-2* 135.34–36, Husserl writes "Cf. [p.] 336." See the next footnote.

[132] Above at *SZ-1* 144.28–31 = *SZ-15* 144.28–31 = *BT-1* 184.15–17 = *BT-2* 135.34–36, Husserl writes "Cf. [p.] 336." See the previous footnote.

337.6 337.7 386.20 310.13

Text in SZ:

"How is inauthentic becoming to be contrasted with this?"

In the right margin:

inauthentic becoming

337.28–30 337.28–29 387.6–8 310.34–35

Text in SZ, all italicized:

"Expecting is one mode (founded on awaiting) of the becoming that authentically unfolds as anticipation."

In the right margin:

N.B.[134]

338.6–7 338.6–8 387.26–28 311.10–11

Text in SZ:

"The *authentic present* – authentic because it is held in authentic temporality – we call the *'the right time'* [*'Augenblick'*]."

In the left margin:

"right time"

338.11–15 338.12–15 387.32–388.3 311.15–18

Text in SZ:

"*In principle*, the phenomenon of the right time can *not* be clarified in terms of the *'now.'* The 'now' is a temporal phenomenon that belongs to time *qua* within-time-ness: [it is] the 'now' 'within which' something arises, passes away, or is just-there."

In the left margin:

N.B.

339.6–7 339.6–7 388.29–30 311.40

Text in SZ:

"Authentic *being*-what-you-already-are is what we call *'retrieval.'* "

In the right margin:

"retrieval"

339.9–10 339.9–10 388.33 311.42–43

Text in SZ:

"...in its ownmost *thrown* ability-to-be, Dasein has *forgotten* itself."

In the right margin:

"forgetting oneself"

---

[133] Above at *SZ-1* 262.17–18 = *SZ-15* 262.15–16 = *BT-1* 306.25–26 = *BT-2* 242.13–14, Husserl refers ahead to this passage.

[134] Below at *SZ-1* 339.24–26 = *SZ-15* 339.23–25 = *BT-1* 389.10–11 = *BT-2* 312.14–16, Husserl will refer back to this passage.

339.19–20 339.18–20 389.5–6 312.9–10

Text in SZ:

"And only on the basis of this forgetting can a concernful and awaiting presenting *retain* [something]..."

In the margin Husserl writes and then crosses out:

Again an inversion.[135]

339.24–26 339.23–25 389.10–11 312.14–16

Text in SZ:

"Just as expecting is possible only on the basis of awaiting, so *remembering* is possible only on the basis of forgetting, *and not* vice versa..."

In the right margin:

N.B. 337[136]

339.26–29 339.25–27 389.11–14 312.16–18

Text in SZ, continuing the preceding sentence:

"...because alreadiness, in the mode of forgottenness, primarily 'discloses' the horizon into which Dasein (lost in the 'outsideness' of the objects of its concern) can re-collect itself."

Husserl underlines:

" 'discloses' "

In the right margin Husserl writes and then crosses out:

Again, an inversion.[137]

§ 68
The Temporality of Disclosedness as Such

(b) The Temporality of Disposition

339.38 339.36 389.23 312.27–28

Text in SZ:

"Understanding is never ungrounded [*freischwebend*], but always disposed."

Husserl underlines:

"ungrounded"

In the right margin:

What is that?

---

[135] Cf. above, *SZ-1* 284.3–6 = *SZ-15* 284.5–7 = *BT-1* 329.29–31 = *BT-2* 262.4–6, and below, *SZ-1* 339.26–29 = *SZ-15* 339.25–27 = *BT-1* 389.11–14 = *BT-2* 310.34–35.

[136] Husserl is referring to *SZ-1* 337.28–30 = *SZ-15* 337.28–29 = *BT-1* 387.6–8 = *BT-2* 310.34–35.

[137] Cf. above *SZ-1* 284.3–6 = *SZ-15* 284.5–7 = *BT-1* 329.29–31 = *BT-2* 262.4–6, and *SZ-1* 339.19–20 = *SZ-15* 339.18–20 = *BT-1* 389.5–6 = *BT-2* 312.9–10.

340.22 340.23 390.18 313.6

Text in SZ:

[Husserl's note here may apply to the entire paragraph that begins "We have emphasized that while moods...."]

In the left margin, in cursive:

disposition

341.6–7 341.6–7 391.8 313.28

Text in SZ:

"We begin the analysis by showing the temporality of *fear*."

In the right margin:

fear

341.27–29 341.25–28 391.30–33 314.4–6

Text in SZ, underlined by Husserl:

"The expectation of something threatening that is approaching need not yet be fear, especially since it lacks the specific mood-character of fear."

In the right margin:

But then is it still "threatening"?
However, cf. the following page.[138]

342.12–18 342.12–20 392.18–24 314.27–32

Text in SZ:

"Corresponding to forgetting oneself in fear there is this *confused presenting* of less-than-important things. It is well known, for instance, that the inhabitants of a burning house will often 'save' the most indifferent things, the most immediately useful things. The self-forgetful presenting of a tangle of unrelated possibilities makes possible the confusion constituting the mood-character of fear."

In the left margin:

So, presenting is seizing, seizing possibilities and perhaps actualities.[139]

342.18–21 342.17–20 392.24–26 314.32–34

Text in SZ:

"Confusion's forgetfulness also changes the character of the awaiting into a depressed or confused awaiting that is different from pure expectation."

Husserl underlines:

"is different from pure expectation"

In the left margin:

Cf. previous page[140]

---

[138] The reference seems to be to all of *SZ-1* 342.12–21 = *SZ-15* 342.12–20 = *BT-1* 392.18–26 = *BT-2* 314.27–34, even though on p. 342 the corresponding reference back to *this* page appears only at the last line of that paragraph.

[139] This remark may apply as well to the next two sentences in *SZ*.

[140] The reference is to *SZ-1* 341.27–29 = *SZ-15* 341.25–28 = *BT-1* 391.30–33 = *BT-2* 314.4–6.

342.30–31 **342.29–30** **392.35–393.1** **314.42–43**

Text in SZ:

"Anything else that belongs to the phenomenon remains a 'feeling of pleasure or displeasure.' "

Just after this sentence Husserl writes in the text:

But must one then remain stuck in it?

342.32–33 **342.31–32** **393.2–3** **315.1–2**

Text in SZ:

"How is the temporality of *dread* related to that of fear? We called this phenomenon [of dread] a basic disposition."[141]

In the left margin, in cursive:

dread[142]

343.24–27 **343.25–28** **393.35–39** **315.31–34**

Text in SZ:

"As disclosed in dread, the insignificance of the world reveals the not-ness of the objects of concern – that is to say, it reveals the impossibility of projecting oneself into any of eksistence's abilities-to-be that are founded primarily on such objects."

In the right margin:

N.B.

343.35–36 **343.36–37** **394.6–7** **315.41–42**

Text in SZ:

"On the contrary, dread brings one back to thrownness as a *retrievable possibility*."

In the right margin:

What does that mean?

345.8–11 **345.8–11** **395.25–28** **317.2–5**

Text in SZ:

"It becomes clear that other moods besides fear and dread are founded eksistentially on alreadiness – to name a few: the phenomena of satiety, sadness, melancholy, and despair."

In the right margin, a large:

?

345.20–22 **345.20–22** **396.1–3** **317.12–13**

Text in SZ:

"...the eksistential meaning of *hoping*. Here, too, the mood-character consists primarily in hoping as *hoping [for something] for oneself*."

---

[141] Heidegger places a footnote here: "Cf. §40, p. 184ff."

[142] At the beginning of §40, above at *SZ-1* 184.10 = *SZ-15* 184.10 = *BT-1* 228.33 = *BT-2* 172.23, Husserl writes: "[p.] 342."

In the right margin:
hope
In the left margin:
N.B.

345.30 345.30 396.11 317.20
Text in SZ:
"Furthermore, the pallid 'moodlessness' of indifference..."
In the right margin:
living-on in indifference [*das gleichgültige Dahinleben*]

345.39 345.38 396.20 317.26–28
Text in SZ:
"Indifference...must be sharply distinguished from equanimity."
In the right margin, in cursive:
equanimity

346.1–3 346.1–3 396.24–27 317.31–33
Text in SZ:
"The only entity that can be affected is one that, by the very meaning of its being, is disposed, i.e., one that, by eksisting, always already-is; one that constantly eksists as already-being."
In the left margin, in cursive:
affection

346.7–8 346.7–8 396.32–33 317.35–38
Text in SZ:
"It remains a problem in itself how to ontologically define sense-*stimulus* and sense-*contact* in merely-living entities, and how and whether[143] the being of animals is at all constituted by some kind of 'time.' "
In the left margin:
time of animals

[143] *SZ-15* changes this "*ob*" [whether] to "*wo*" [where].

§ 68
The Temporality of Disclosedness as Such

(c) The Temporality of Fallenness

346.24–25 346.24–25 397.11–12 318.11–12

Text in SZ:

"Curiosity is a distinctive tendency of Dasein's being; in accordance with it, Dasein concerns itself with an ability-to-see."

In the left margin, in cursive:

curiosity[144]

347.2–4 347.2–5 397.25–28 318.24–26

Text in SZ:

"Curiosity is an entirely inauthentic form of becoming insofar as it does not await a *possibility* but, in its greediness, desires the possibility only as actual."

In the right margin:

?

347.16–18 347.16–18 398.9–11 318.38–39

Text in SZ:

"The 'arising' [of presenting from awaiting] is an ekstatic modification of awaiting, such that awaiting 'pursues' presenting."

In the right margin:

arising and persuing[145]

§ 68
The Temporality of Disclosedness as Such

(d) The Temporality of Discursiveness

349.25–29 349.25–29 400.36–40 320.34–39

Text in SZ:

"We will be able to broach the analysis of the temporal constitution of discursiveness and the explanation of the temporal character of forms of speech only if we first develop the problem of the fundamental connection between being and truth, in terms of the problematic of temporality."

In the left margin:

N.B.

---

[144] See the footnote above at *SZ-1* 170.21 = *SZ* 15th ed. 170.22 = *BT-1* 214.23 = *BT-2* 159.32. Husserl glosses the section title "§36 Curiosity" with "[p.] 344," possibly a lapsus for "346.".

[145] Heidegger's text puns on *entspringen* ("springing from") and *nachspringen* ("springing after" in the sense of "pursuing"). Husserl's remark seems to apply as well to the previous two (perhaps three) sentences in *SZ*.

349.29–34 **349.30–35** **400.40–401.5** **320.39–321.1**

Text in SZ:

"Then too we can delimit the ontological meaning of the 'is,' which a superficial theory of the proposition and judgment has degraded into the 'copula.' Only from the temporality of discursiveness – that is, from the temporality of Dasein as such – can we clarify the 'genesis' of 'meaning' and render ontologically intelligible the possibility of concept-formation."

In the right margin:

ontological meaning of "is"
"superficial theory of judgment"
possibility of concept-formation

§ 69
The Temporality of Being-in-a-world and the Problem of a World's Transcendence

351.33–38 **351.33–37** **402.35–41** **322.24–28**

Text in SZ:

"The thematic analysis of the temporal constitution of being-in-a-world leads to the questions: In what way is any kind of world possible at all? In what sense *is* world? What does the world transcend, and how? How do 'independent' innerworldly entities 'cohere' with the transcending world?"

In the left margin:

N.B.

(a) The Temporality of Practical Concern

352.28–31 **352.27–30** **403.32–35** **323.17–19**

Text in SZ:

"But one must understand, further, that concernful dealing never just stays with an individual implement. The use and handling of a specific implement remains, as such, oriented to an implemental context."

In the left margin, in cursive:

objection

352.31–34 **352.30–33** **403.35–39** **323.19–22**

Text in SZ:

"For example, when we look for a 'misplaced' implement, the sought-for is not simply or primarily intended in some isolated 'act'; instead, the horizon of the implemental whole has already been discovered beforehand."

In the left margin, in cursive:

isolated act

353.16–18 **353.16–17** **404.22–23** **323.41–324.1**

Text in SZ:

"Concern's practical-disclosive being-with... is letting-[something]-be-involved, i.e., an understanding projection of involvement."

Husserl underlines:

"letting-[something]-be-involved, i.e., an understanding projection of involvement."

In the right margin:

Isn't that setting goals, seeking out means and putting them into action, etc.?

353.37–38 **353.34–35** **405.5** **324.16**

Text in SZ:

"[Awaiting the 'that-for-which'] does not at all have the character of a thematic grasping."

In the left margin:

theoretical-[thematic][146]

354.10–11 **354.9–10** **405.17–18** **324.27–28**

Text in SZ:

"A specific kind of *forgetting* is essential for the temporality that constitutes letting-[something]-be-involved ."

In the left margin, in cursive:

of oneself![147]

354.17–20 **354.16–19** **405.24–28** **324.33–36**

Text in SZ:

"Awaiting-and-retentive presenting constitutes that familiarity whereby Dasein, as being-with-others, 'knows its way around' its lived world. We understand letting-[something]-be-involved as a letting-[it]-'be.' "

Husserl underlines:

"constitutes"

In the left margin:

Constitutes familiarity? What does "constitutes" mean?
What does "letting-[something]-be" mean?

354.25–27 **354.24–25** **405.33–34** **324.41–42**

Text in SZ:

"The useful implement is encountered in its true 'in-itself-ness' precisely not by way of a thematic perception of things...."

In the left margin, in cursive:

Yes, who says so?[148]

---

[146] That is: Husserl writes "*theoretisch-*" and thereby glosses "*thematischen*" to read "*theoretisch-thematischen*": "a theoretical-thematic grasping."

[147] That is: "[a forgetting] of oneself!"

[148] Husserl's "*Ja, wer sagt das?*" possibly has the sense of "And who ever said it did?"

354.35–36 354.34–36 406.4–6 325.8–9

Text in SZ:

"Something unuseful – say, an implement's failure to work – can be conspicuous for us[149] in dealings entailing manipulation."

In the left margin:

? !

354.37–39 354.36–355.1 406.6–8 325.9–11

Text in SZ:

"Even the sharpest and most persistent 'perception' and 'ideation' of things can never discover anything like the damaging of an implement."

In the left margin, in cursive:

objection

355.2–4 355.3–5 406.10–13 325.13–16

Text in SZ:

"Awaiting-and-retentive presenting gets held up (by what will later show itself as damage) as regards its absorption in the relations-of-involvement."

In the right margin, in cursive:

holding up

355.13–17 355.14–17 406.23–26 325.23–27

Text in SZ:

"If concernful dealings were merely a sequence of 'experiences' running their course 'in time' (no matter how intimately they might be 'associated' with one another), letting a conspicuous unuseful implement encounter us it would be ontologically impossible."

Husserl underlines:

"merely"

In the right margin:

Sure, "merely"!

In the left margin:

objection[150]

355.28–31 355.28–31 407.3–7 325.37–40

Text in SZ:

"If practical letting-[something]-be-involved were not, through and through, *awaiting* the object of its concern, and if awaiting did not unfold in *unity with* a presenting, Dasein could never 'find' that something is missing."

---

[149] *SZ-15* changes this "*uns*" ("for us") to "*nur*," so that the sentence then reads: "...can be conspicuous only in...."

[150] Although this remark appears opposite the previous sentence, it seems to be directed at the present text.

In the right margin:
obviously![151]

356.1–2 356.1–2 407.17–18 326.6–7
Text in SZ:
"But putting up with [something] is a mode peculiar to practical letting-[something]-encounter."
In the left margin:
putting up with [*Sichabfinden*]

356.2–4 356.2–4 407.18–20 326.7–9
Text in SZ:
"On the basis of this kind of discovering, concern can run across the inconvenient, disturbing, hindering, endangering – in general, whatever is in some way resistant."
In the left margin, in cursive:
[the] resistant

356.28–30 356.27–29 408.7–9 326.31–33
Text in SZ:
"With this aim we shall trace the 'genesis' of the theoretical attitude towards the 'world,' as that attitude arises from practical concern with the useful."
In the left margin, in cursive:
Ontological genesis of -- the theoretical attitude towards the world[152]

(b) The Temporal Meaning of the Modification of Practical Concern Into the Theoretical Discovering of What is Just-there Within-a-world

357.2–6 357.3–7 408.19–23 327.2–5
Text in SZ, all underlined by Husserl:
In seeking the *ontological genesis* of the theoretical attitude, we ask: What are the eksistentially necessary conditions, found in Dasein's being-structure, that make it possible for Dasein to eksist in the form of scientific research?"
In the right margin:
N.B.

---

[151] It is possible that this remark applies to the previous sentence in *SZ*.
[152] The grammar is problematic: "*Ontologische Genesis der -- das theoretische Verhältnis zur Welt.*" The remark is written in the margin in such a way as to include the following section-title as well.

357.11–19 357.17–20 408.32–36 327.14–17

Text in SZ:

"The following deliberations are preparatory to the understanding of *this central problematic,* within which, moreover, the idea of phenomenology (as distinguished from the preliminary concept of it, which we indicated by way of introduction) will be developed for the first time.

Husserl underlines:

"idea of phenomenology"

In the left margin:

goal of clarifying the idea of phenomenology

357.22–25 357.23–26 408.39–409.2 327.20–22

Text in SZ:

"We shall investigate only the change *from* practical concern with the useful *to* exploration of the useful that is found within-a-world."

In the right margin:

N.B.

358.4–7 358.5–8 409.22–24 327.40–42

Text in SZ:

"Refraining from using an implement is far from being sheer 'theory.' Insofar as practical insight stays with and 'considers' [the task], it remains wholly in the grip of the useful implement with which one is concerned."

In the left margin:

theoretical activity as praxis

358.21–28 358.22–28 409.38–410.2 328.13–18

Text in SZ:

"This trivial point certainly shows that it is far from obvious where the ontological boundary between 'theoretical' and 'atheoretical' behavior really runs.

"Someone will claim that all manipulation in the sciences merely stands in the service of pure observation – the investigative discovering and disclosing of the things 'themselves.' "

Husserl underlines:

"the ontological boundary between 'theoretical' and 'atheoretical' behavior...runs"

In the left margin:

When I parted with this way of speaking, it held for the description of the world as a world of experiences, as pregiven for theoretical research.[153]

[153] This marginal note may refer not only to these two lines but to the following two sentences as well.

359.13–17 359.13–17 410.24–28 328.40–329.1

Text in SZ:

"The specific practical-explicating bringing-near of what we are concerned about is called *deliberation*. Deliberation's peculiar schema is the 'if–then' – for example, if this or that is to be produced, put to use, or prevented, then some ways and means, circumstances or opportunities will be needed."

Husserl underlines:

"*deliberation*" and " 'if–then' "

In the right margin:

"deliberation"

and in cursive:

if–then

359.19–20 359.19–20 410.30–32 329.3–4

Text in SZ:

"Accordingly, such deliberation never merely 'affirms' the just-there-ness of an entity or its properties."

In the right margin:

No one would even say that.

359.26–27 359.26–27 410.38–39 329.9–10

Text in SZ (all underlined by Husserl):

"Practical insight that renders present does not relate itself to 'mere representations.' "

In the right margin:

Who says it does?

361.16–18 361.17–19 412.34–35 330.32–33

Text in SZ:

"The *understanding of being* that guides concernful dealings with innerworldly entities *has changed over*."

In the right margin, in cursive:

change over [*Umschlag*]

361.30–32 361.31–33 413.10–12 331.2–4

Text in SZ:

"Certainly not, if this 'modification' is supposed to mean: a change in the kind of being (understood in understanding) of the entity before us."

In the right margin:

But what is this supposed to mean?

362.5–6 362.6–7 413.26–27 331.18

Text in SZ:

"The totality of what is just-there becomes the theme."

In the left margin:

of what is physically just-there[154]

362.8–11 362.8–12 413.28–32 331.19–23

Text in SZ:

"In the present case, the modification in one's understanding of being entails dissolving the borders of the lived world [*Entschränkung der Umwelt*]. And following the lead of the now dominant understanding of being as just-there-ness, the dissolving of these borders also becomes a delineating of the 'region' of the just-there."[155]

In the left margin:

?

362.30–32 362.31–33 414.9–12 331.40–43

Text in SZ:

"In the mathematical projection of nature, moreover, what is decisive is not necessarily the mathematical as such but the fact that the projection discloses an *a priori*."

Husserl underlines:

"mathematical" and "*a priori*"

In the left margin:

= quantitative

362.32–41 362.33–363.3 414.12–22 332.2–9

Text in SZ:

"[The paradigmatic character of mathematical natural science] consists, rather, in the fact that, in it, the thematic entities are discovered in the only way entities can be discovered: in a prior projection of their being-structure. By working out, in basic concepts, the guiding understanding of being, we also determine the clues of [the science's] methods, the structure of its way of conceiving things, the possibility of truth and certainty that belongs to it, the ways things get grounded or proven, the mode in which it is binding for us, and the way it is communicated. The totality of these items constitutes the full eksistential conception of science."

In the left margin:

But how does this take place? Whence do we know this?

363.3–6 363.4–7 414.24–27 332.10–13

Text in SZ:

"The scientific projection of whatever entities we have already encountered lets us explicitly understand their kind of being, such that the

---

[154] Husserl seems to be glossing Heidegger's phrase "of what is just-there" with "physically."

[155] Husserl's question mark is perhaps related to Heidegger's neologism "*Entschränkung*," which has the sense of "unconfining" or "opening the borders of...."

possible forms of a pure discovering of innerworldly entities becomes manifest."

Husserl underlines:

"scientific projection"

In the right margin:

But we must first have it, we must first ground it – not, however, through such vague generalities [as those] of Heidegger.

363.6–10 **363.7–10** **414.27–32** **332.13–16**

Text in SZ:

"The whole of this projecting – which includes the articulation of the understanding of being, the consequent delimiting of the subject-area, and the delineation of the concepts suitable to these entities – is what we call *thematizing*."

In the right margin:

"thematizing"

363.10–12 **363.10–13** **414.32–34** **332.16–19**

Text in SZ:

"[Thematizing] aims at freeing up the entities met within-a-world, in such a way that they are 'thrown-against' an act of pure discovering, i.e., can become 'ob-jects.' "

In the left margin:

?

363.13–16 **363.13–17** **414.34–38** **332.19–21**

Text in SZ:

"Thematizing objectifies. It does not first 'posit' the entity, but frees it so that it can be 'objectively' questioned and determined. The objectifying being-with something just-there within-a-world is characterized by a *distinctive kind of making-present*."

Husserl underlines:

"It does not first 'posit' the entity...'objectively' questioned and determined"

In right margin:

?

and the comment:

For me, entities are in being [*seiend*] in a subjective "how" that I can interrogate. For me, to posit means to be in certainty, and it is called positing because it is a "pro-posing" from out of myself.[156]

In left margin:

But first I have intentionality, and first I have to interrogate it, to lay out its essential structure, and then I can see that, enclosed in the "projection"

---

[156] *"Das Seiende ist für mich seiend in einem subjektiven Wie, das ich befragen kann. Setzen besagt für mich Sein in Gewißheit und heißt Setzung, weil sie aus mir her ein 'Satz' ist."*

of intentionality, there is the *a priori*, an essential structure that, once I have constituted it, can thereafter become [a] scientifically guiding [factor].

363, n.1 363, n.1 498, n.xxiii 413, n.22

Text in SZ:

"The thesis that all cognition aims at 'intuition' has this temporal meaning: all cognizing is a making-present. Whether every science or even philosophical cognition aims at a making-present, need not be decided here. – Husserl uses the expression 'make present' in characterizing sensory perception. Cf. his *Logische Untersuchungen*, first edition, 1901, vol. II, pp. 588 and 620.[157] The *intentional* analysis of perception and intuition in general must have suggested this 'temporal' characterization of the phenomenon. The fact that, and the way in which, the intentionality of 'consciousness' is grounded in ekstatic temporality will be shown in the next Division."

Husserl underlines:

"grounded"

In the right margin:

?

N.B.

In the left margin:

What does "grounding" mean?

363.19–21 363.19–22 415.2–4 332.25–27

Text in SZ:

"This awaiting of discoveredness is grounded eksistentielly in a resolution whereby Dasein projects itself in terms of its ability-to-be in the 'truth.' "

Husserl underlines:

"is grounded eksistentielly"

In the text, Husserl adds "1)" after "eksistentiell." At the bottom of the page he writes:[158]

1) Thematizing is the unacknowledged intentional achievement of prescientific activity on the basis of pre-giving passive intentionality. If it is disclosed in the requisite systematic treatment of its clues, one comes to concrete subjectivity and intersubjectivity and their *a priori* structure. Finally one finds the constitution of personality, which of course from the

---

[157] In the *Husserliana* edition (1984), vol. XIX/2, pp. 646.24 ("*das Gegenwärtigen* [*Präsentieren*]") and 677.11 (*gegenwärtigt*). In the E.T., *Logical Investigations*, pp. 761.16 ("direct presentation") and 789.22 ("gives the object presence").

[158] It seems this note is *not* related to the German words "*gründet exististentiell*" that bear the notation "1)." Rather, they could be a comment on the previous entry's last words: "The fact that, and the way in which, the intentionality of 'consciousness' is grounded in ekstatic temporality will be shown in the next Division" -- which Husserl marks with a "N.B."

very start characterizes being-a-subject; but the last of the teleological structures, which confers personality on the monad, goes unclarified.[159]

363.24–27 **363.25–27** **415.7–9** **332.30–33**

Text in SZ:

"At this point it is sufficient if we simply understand the fact that, and the way in which, the thematizing of entities within-a-world presupposes Dasein's basic structure: being-in-a-world."

In the right margin:

N.B.

365.1–3 **365.2–4** **416.12–14** **333.31–32**

Text in SZ:

"The unity of significance – that is, the ontological constitution of the world – must then also be grounded in temporality."

In the right margin:

The unintelligible "grounding"

365.8–9 **365.8** **416.18–19** **333.36**

Text in SZ:

"We call this 'whereunto' of the ekstasis its 'horizonal schema.' "

In the right margin, in cursive:

horizonal schema

366.13–15 **366.12–14** **417.28–30** **334.39–41**

Text in SZ:

"Thus the relationships of significance that determine the structure of the world are not a network of forms that a worldless subject has laid over some kind of material."

Husserl underlines:

"a worldless subject has laid over some kind of material"

In the left margin, in cursive:

objection

366.24–26 **366.23–25** **417.39–418.1** **335.7–8**

Text in SZ:

"What we have to ask is: what makes it ontologically possible that entities be encountered within-a-world and, as encountered, be objectified?"

In the left margin:

"objectified"

---

[159] On the front endpaper of *SZ-1* Husserl writes "thematizing" to call attention to this note.

366.28–31 **366.28–31** **418.3–6** **335.11–14**

Text in SZ:

"If the 'subject' gets conceived ontologically as an eksisting Dasein whose being is grounded in temporality, then one must say that the world is 'subjective.' But in that case, this 'subjective' world, *qua* temporally transcendent, is more 'objective' than any possible 'object.' "

In the left margin, Husserl brackets the entire paragraph and writes:

"object" always in the Heideggerian sense of just-there-ness

366.35–39 **366.35–39** **418.9–13** **335.17–21**

Text in SZ:

"At the same time it becomes clear that we can tackle a concrete elaboration of the world-structure in general and its possible variations only if the ontology of possible entities within-a-world is oriented securely enough by clarifying the idea of being in general."

Husserl underlines:

"concrete elaboration of the world-structure" to the end of the sentence.

In the left margin:

?

N.B.

366.39–41 **366.39–41** **418.13–15** **335.21–24**

Text in SZ:

"If an interpretation of this idea is to be possible, the temporality of Dasein must be exhibited beforehand; here our characterization of being-in-a-world will be of service."

In the left margin, in cursive:

re method [*Methodisch*]

§ 70
The Temporality of the Spatiality that is Characteristic of Dasein

368.4–7 **368.4–7** **419.15–17** **336.21–24**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein takes up space – literally. By no means is Dasein just-there in a section of space that its body fills up. In eksisting, Dasein has already cleared some lived space [*Spielraum*] for itself."

In the left margin, only the first phrase in cursive:

cleared for itself

Dasein's "lived space"

368.9–11 **368.9–11** **419.19–22** **336.26–28**

Text in SZ:

"In order to say that Dasein is just-there at a position in space, we first have to *grasp* this entity in an ontologically inappropriate way."

In the left margin:

"ontologically inappropriate"

368.18–20 **368.17–20** **419.27–30** **336.34–36**

Text in SZ:

"On the contrary, because Dasein is 'spiritual' – *and only because of this* – can it be spatial in a certain way that is essentially impossible for any extended corporeal thing."

Husserl underlines:

be spatial in a certain way

In the left margin:

"to be spatial" – paradoxical talk

369.9–12 **369.8–11** **420.30–35** **337.20–26**

Text in SZ:

"Because Dasein, as temporal, is ekstatic-horizonal in its being, it can factically and constantly take along [with it] a cleared space. As regards this ekstatically occupied space, it is not at all the case that the 'here' of its current factical locus or situation signifies a spatial position. Instead, it signifies the lived space (which is opened up in directionality and removing) of the arena of a set of implements that one is immediately concerned with."

In the right margin, partly in cursive:

[the] "here" as lived space [*Hier als Spielraum*]

§ 71
The Temporal Meaning of Dasein's Everydayness

370.30–35 **370.28–34** **422.15–20** **338.40–339.5**

Text in SZ:

"In our analyses we have often used the phrase 'usually and generally' ['*zunächst und zumeist*']. 'Usually' signifies: the way Dasein is 'manifest' in the 'with-each-other' of publicness, even if 'fundamentally' Dasein has eksistentielly 'overcome' everydayness. 'Generally' signifies the way in which Dasein shows up for Everyone, not all the time but 'as a rule'."

In the left margin:

usually and generally
"as a rule"[160]

370.36–39 **370.35–38** **422.21–26** **339.6–9**

Text in SZ:

" 'Everydayness' means the 'how' whereby Dasein 'gets through the day,' whether in all its forms of behavior or only in certain ones prescribed by sociality. This 'how,' in its turn, includes the comfortableness of habituality...."

Husserl underlines:

comfortableness of habituality

In the left margin:

habituality [is] simply presupposed and not described

371.6–8 **371.6–8** **422.31–33** **339.14–16**

Text in SZ:

"These manifold characteristics of everydayness, however, by no means designate it as a mere 'aspect' provided by Dasein when it 'observes' the things people do."

In the right margin:

?

371.20–22 **371.20–22** **423.3–4** **339.26–27**

Text in SZ:

"The 'natural' horizon for starting the eksistential analytic of Dasein is *only seemingly self-evident*."

In the right margin, in cursive:

yes

[160] Husserl's phrase, "as a rule," picks up the same phrase from the last sentence of the previous paragraph.

DIVISION TWO

CHAPTER FIVE
Temporality and Historicity

§ 72
The Eksistential-ontological Exposition of the Problem of History

373.1–3 **373.3–4** **425.5** **342.9**

Text in SZ:

"The other 'end,' however, is the 'beginning,' the 'birth.' "

In the right margin:

birth

373.38–41 **373.38–41** **426.2–5** **343.1–4**

Text in SZ:

"Whether we admit it or not, this way of characterizing the connectedness of life posits something just-there 'in time,' although obviously 'un-thinglike.' "

Husserl underlines:

something just-there 'in time'

In the left margin:

N.B.

374.20–23 **374.20–23** **426.26–29** **343.25–27**

Text in SZ:

"...[Dasein] *itself* is extended in such a way that from the outset its proper being is constituted as an extending [*Erstreckung*]."[161]

In the left margin:

"constituted," in my sense [of the word][162]

375.2–3 **374.41–375.2** **427.7–9** **344.2–4**

Text in SZ:

"The being-in-movement [*Bewegtheit*] of eksistence is not the motion of something just-there. It is defined in terms of Dasein's extension."

In the right margin:

?[163]

---

[161] Heidegger is implicitly adapting St. Augustine's "*distentio animi*" (*Confessiones* XI, 26). Cf. Heidegger's "Des hl. Augustinus Betrachtung über die Zeit. Confessiones lib. XI," a conference he gave at St. Martin's Abbey, Beuron, October 26, 1930 (typescript).

[162] The quotation marks have been added by the present editor.

[163] Husserl's question mark could apply to only the first of Heidegger's two sentences.

375.3–5 **375.2–4** **427.9–11** **344.4–5**

Text in SZ:

"The specific being-in-movement of an *extended self-extending* is what we call Dasein's *being-historical* [*Geschehen*]."

In the right margin:

Dasein's being-historical

375.6–9 **375.5–8** **427.12–15** **344.7–9**

Text in SZ:

"To lay bare the *structure of being-historical* and the ekistential-temporal conditions of its possibility, signifies that one has achieved an *ontological* understanding of *historicity*."

In the left margin:

N.B.

375.35–38 **375.34–37** **428.3–6** **344.31–34**

Text in SZ:

"If we are to cast light on historicity itself in terms of temporality – and originally in terms of *authentic* temporality – then the very essence of this task entails that we can carry it out only via a phenomenological construction."

In the right margin:

The "originally" poses a difficulty.

377.1–4 **376.40–377.2** **429.3–6** **345.29–32**

Text in SZ:

"Dasein experiences whatever may happen 'to it' as 'happening in time.' In the same way, [Dasein] encounters the processes of nature, whether lifeless or living, 'in time.' They are within-time."

In the left margin:

N.B.

377.26–29 **377.24–26** **429.26–28** **346.9–11**

Text in SZ:

"The investigations of Dilthey were, for their part, pioneering work; but today's generation has not yet made them its own. In the following analysis the issue is solely one of furthering their adoption."

In the left margin:

N.B.!

§ 73
The Ordinary Understanding of History, and Dasein's Being-Historical

379.15–17 **379.16–17** **431.9–10** **347.27–28**

Text in SZ:

"History is eksistent Dasein's specific being-historical...."

In the right margin:

of many Daseins?

379.28–29 **379.28–29** **431.21** **347.39–40**

Text in SZ:

"Or is Dasein's being first constituted by being-historical...?"

In the right margin:

"constituted"

381.26–32 **381.24–30** **433.13–20** **349.24–30**

Text in SZ:

"Non-Dasein entities that are historical by reason of belonging to the world, we call 'world-historical.' It can be shown that the common concept of 'world-history' comes directly out of an orientation to the historical in this secondary sense. What is world-historical does not first become historical by being objectified by historians but rather does so *as the entity* that it is in itself and that is met within a world."

In the right margin, in cursive:

world-history 389[164]

In the left margin, next to "orientation to the historical...":

?

§ 74
The Basic Structure of Historicity

383.21–2 **383.20–1** **435.4–5** **351.3–4**

Text in SZ:

"As thrown, Dasein has indeed been delivered over to itself and to its ability-to-be, *but as being-in-a-world.*"

In the right margin, in cursive:

thrownness

384.6–7 **384.6–7** **435.27–29** **351.25–26**

Text in SZ:

"Only being free *for* death gives Dasein its goal outright and pushes eksistence into its finitude."

---

[164] The reference is to *SZ-1* 389.4 = *SZ-2* 389.3 = *BT-1* 440.37 = *BT-2* 355.21–22.

In the left margin:
finitude

384.7–11 384.7–11 435.29–33 351.26–29
Text in SZ:
"When grasped, the finitude of eksistence pulls Dasein back from the endless array of readily available possibilities – comfortableness, sloughing off, taking matters lightly – and delivers Dasein into the simplicity of its *fate*."
In the left margin, in cursive:
fate cf. 386[165]

384.11–14 384.11–14 435.33–36 351.29–32
Text in SZ:
"[By the word 'fate'] we designate Dasein's original being-historical, which lies in authentic resolution and in which Dasein *frees* itself for itself – free for death – in a possibility that it has both inherited and chosen."
In the left margin:
N.B.[166]

384.30–36 384.30–35 436.14–20 352.2–7
Text in SZ:
"But if fateful Dasein, as being-in-a-world, eksists essentially in being-with others, its being-historical is a co-being-historical, and is determinative for it as *shared fate* [*Geschick*]. This is how we designate the being-historical of the community, of a people. Shared fate is not cobbled together out of individual fates, any more than being-with-each-other can be understood as the coming together of several subjects."
In the left margin, partly in cursive:
shared fate ([of the] community) and fate (of the individual)

385.11–14 385.11–13 437.6–12 352.19–24
Text in SZ (all in italics):
"Only an entity whose very being is essentially **becoming**, such that it can be thrown back onto its factical 'openness' by being free for and shattering against its death – that is, only an entity whose **alreadiness** is co-original with its becoming – can free up for itself its inherited possibility and appropriate its own thrownness, and be **in the right time** for 'its era.' Only authentic, finite temporality makes possible fate – that is, authentic historicity."

---

[165] Husserl's reference is to *SZ-1* 386.28–29. *SZ-15* 386.27–28, *BT-1* 438.22–23 = *BT-2* 353.20–21. See also the following footnote.

[166] This mark appears so close to the previous one that the two may well be meant as a single marginal note.

In the right margin:

Thus only human beings have history.

385.23–25 385.20–23 437.14–18 352.26–29

Text in SZ:

"But Dasein's temporality, and it alone, has the possibility of *explicitly* pulling up, from out of the traditional understanding of Dasein, the eksistentiel ability-to-be in terms of which it projects itself."

Husserl underlines:

possibility, pulling up

In the right margin:

again, a paradoxical way of speaking

385.26–28 385.23–25 437.18–20 352.29–31

Text in SZ:

"The resolution that returns to itself and frees itself up, then becomes the *retrieval* of an inherited possibility of eksistence."

In the left margin:

Why retrieval?[167]

385.28–30 385.25–27 437.20–21 352.31–33

Text in SZ:

"*Retrieval is explicit freeing-up* – which means going back into the possibilities of already-eksisting Dasein."

In the right margin:

but "retrieval" as explicit freeing-up

385.34–36 385.32–34 437.26–28 352.37–39

Text in SZ:

"The retrieving and freeing-up of an already operative possibility discloses already-eksisting Dasein, but not for the purpose of re-actualizing it."

In the left margin:

So [there is] no repetition after all.[168]

386.4–5 386.3–5 438.1–2 352.43–353.1

Text in SZ:

"Rather, retrieval *responds* to the possibility of already operative eksistence."

Husserl underlines:

retrieval *responds* to

In the left margin:

So [there is] certainly no repetition

---

[167] The word *Wiederholung* can mean both "retrieval" and "repetition." Husserl may be taking it in the latter sense.

[168] See the previous footnote. Husserl's remark here seems to recognize that *Wiederholung* does not mean "repetition."

386.11–13 **386.10–12** **438.8–9** **353.6–7**

Text in SZ:

"We characterize retrieval as that mode of self-liberating resolution by which Dasein eksists explicitly as fate."

In the left margin:

"retrieval"
N.B.

386.13–22 **386.12–21** **438.9–17** **353.7–14**

Text in SZ:

"But if fate constitutes the original historicity of Dasein, then the essential importance of history lies neither in the past nor in the present and its connection with the past, but in eksistence's authentic being-historical as it arises from Dasein's *becoming*. As Dasein's way of being, history is so essentially rooted in becoming that death (as we described this possibility of Dasein) throws anticipatory eksistence back upon its *factical* thrownness and thus first lends *alreadiness* its peculiarly privileged position in the historical.

In the left margin:

N.B.

386.28–29 **386.27–28** **438.22–23** **353.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"The anticipatory freeing-up [of Dasein] for the 'openness' of the right time is what we call fate."

In the left margin:

"fate" 384[169]

386.38–40 **386.36–38** **438.31–33** **353.29–31**

Text in SZ:

"That which we have hitherto characterized as historicity – in conformity with the being-historical found in anticipatory resolution – we now designate as Dasein's 'authentic historicity.' "

In the left margin, partly in cursive:

authentic historicity

387.14–17 **387.13–16** **439.12–15** **353.43–354.3**

Text in SZ:

"The course of the eksistential analytic thus far has made it utterly clear that the ontology of Dasein is always falling back on the allures of the ordinary understanding of being."

In the right margin:

N.B.!!?

---

[169] Husserl's reference is to *SZ-1* 384.7–11 - *SZ-15* 384.7–11 = *BT-1* 435.29–33 = *BT-2* 351.26–29.

§ 75
Dasein's Historicity and World-history

387.36–38 **387.33–35** **439.31–33** **354.20–21**

Text in SZ:

"Understanding signifies being projected in terms of the current possibility of being-in-a-world; that is, eksisting as this possibility."

In the right margin:

precisely intentionality

388.8–10 **388.7–9** **440.4–7** **354.33–36**

Text in SZ:

"We initially calculate an individual Dasein's progress, stoppages, readjustments, and 'output' in terms of the course, status, changes, and availability of what Dasein is concerned with."

In the left margin:

This is not clear.

388.24–26 **388.23–25** **440.20–23** **355.6–8**

Text in SZ:

"The thesis of Dasein's historicity does not mean that some worldless subject is historical, but only the entity that eksists as being-in-a-world."

Husserl underlines:

"worldless subject is historical"

In the left margin:

What does that mean?

389.4 **389.3** **440.37** **355.21–22**

Text in SZ:

"We call such entities *world-historical.*"

In the margin:

world-history 381[170]

389.4–6 **389.4–5** **440.37–39** **355.22–24**

Text in SZ:

"Here we should note the double significance of our chosen expression 'world history,' which we here understand ontologically."

Husserl underlines:

"world-" [*in the word "world-history"*]

In the left margin:

Why related to mere nature?

---

[170] The reference is to *SZ-1* 381.26–32 = *SZ-15* 381.24–30 = *BT-1* 433.13–20 = *BT-2* 349.24–30.

389.11–13 **389.11–13** **441.4–6** **355.29–31**

Text in SZ:

"That which 'happens' with implements and work as such has its own character of being-in-movement [*Bewegtheit*] that has been completely obscure up until now."

In the right margin:

being-in-movement

389.13–15 **389.13–14** **441.6–8** **355.31–32**

Text in SZ:

"For example, when a ring is 'presented' to someone and 'worn,' what the ring undergoes in its being is no mere change of place."

In the right margin:

N.B.

389.15–17 **389.14–16** **441.8–10** **355.32–34**

Text in SZ:

"The being-in-movement of being-historical, where 'something really happens,' cannot be understood in terms of motion as change of place."

In the right margin:

enigma of "motion"

389.30–31 **389.29–30** **441.23–25** **356.3–5**

Text in SZ:

"And because factical Dasein, as falling, is absorbed in what it is concerned with, it usually understands its history in terms of world-history."

In the left margin:

?

In the right margin:

?!

389.31–35 **389.30–34** **441.25–29** **356.5–9**

Text in SZ:

"Moreover, because the ordinary understanding of being takes 'being' as just-there-ness without further differentiation, the being of the world-historical is experienced and interpreted as the being of something just-there that arrives, is present, and disappears."

In the left margin:

?

390.2–3 **390.1–3** **441.37–38** **356.16–17**

Text in SZ:

"Inauthentically eksisting Dasein first calculates its history in terms of what it is concerned with."

In the left margin:

Not clear

392.4–8 **392.4–8** **444.9–12** **358.8–11**

Text in SZ:

"The obscurities are all the harder to dispel if we have not disentangled the possible dimensions of the appropriate inquiry, and if everything is haunted by the *enigma* of *being* and, (as we have shown) by that of *motion*."

In the left margin:

enigma of motion

§ 76
Dasein's Historicity as the Eksistential Source of Historical Science

393.32–35 **393.32–35** **445.30–33** **359.25–28**

Text in SZ:

"But in so far as Dasein's being is historical – i.e., is open in its alreadiness, by reason of ekstatico-horizonal temporality – the way is clear for thematizing the 'past' in general, a thematizing that is carried out in eksistence."

In the right margin:

The individual? And intersubjectivity?

§ 77
The Connection between the Foregoing Exposition of the Problem of Historicity with the Investigations of Wilhelm Dilthey and the Ideas of Count Yorck

398.17–19 **398.18–20** **450.16–18** **363.26–28**

Text in SZ:

"[Dilthey's goal is] to gain a philosophical understanding of 'life' and to secure for this understanding a hermeneutical foundation from out of 'life itself.' "

In the left margin:

N.B.!

400.6–9 **400.5–7** **451.34–36** **365.4–7**

Text in SZ:

[Yorck to Dilthey:] "But your conception of history is that of a nexus of forces, of unities of force, to which the category of 'Gestalt' is to be applied only by a kind of transference."

In the left margin:

I am as yet unable to find this particularly illuminating.

400.39–41 **400.36–39** **452.24–25** **365.38–39**

Text in SZ:

[Yorck to Dilthey:] "Like the over-refined French society of the revolutionary period, these 'scientists' stand against the powers of the times."

In the left margin:

N.B.

402.1–3 **401.41–402.1** **453.26–28** **366.41–367.1**

Text in SZ:

[Yorck to Dilthey:] "But on the other hand, in view of the inward historicity of self-consciousness, a systematics that is divorced from history is methodologically inadequate."

In the left margin:

[what is] meant [is]: philosophical systematics

403.23–30 **403.23–30** **455.11–18** **368.26–37**

Text in SZ:

"But that is possible only if we have this insight: (1) The question of historicity is an *ontological* question about the being-structure of historical entities; (2) the question of the ontic is the *ontological* question of the being-structure of non-Dasein entities – the just-there in the broadest sense; (3) the ontic is only *one* domain of entities. The idea of being embraces both the 'ontic' and the 'historical.' It is *this idea* that must be 'generically differentiated.' "

In the margin:

Why [is] constitutive phenomenology not here?

403.35–39 **403.35–39** **455.23–26** **368.41–369.2**

Text in SZ:

"The problem of differentiating between the ontic and the historical can be worked out as a problem for investigation only if *we have first assured ourselves what its clue is*, by the fundamental-ontological clarification of the meaning of being as such."

In the right margin:

?

DIVISION TWO

CHAPTER SIX
Temporality and Within-time-ness as the Source of the Ordinary Conception of Time

§ 79
The Temporality of Dasein and Our Concern for Time

406.16–33 **406.15–32** **458.15–33** **373.18–34**

Text in SZ:

[The entire paragraph that begins "Dasein eksists as an entity..."]

In the left margin:

brief summary

407.12–14 **407.12–14** **459.18–20** **374.11–12**

Text in SZ:

"Thus the 'now,' the 'then,' and the 'before' have an apparently obvious relational structure that we call '*datability*' [*Datierbarkeit*]."

In the right margin, in cursive:

datability

411.3–6 **410.39–411.2** **463.33–36** **377.29–32**

Text in SZ:

"When the 'now that...' and the 'then when...' have been explicated and expressed in our everyday being-with-each-other, they will be understood in principle, even though their dating is not unequivocal except within certain limits."

In the right margin:

Why understood in principle?

§ 80
The Kind of Time that Goes with Concern, and Within-time-ness

411.29–34 **411.24–28** **464.19–24** **378.11–15**

Text in SZ:

"Rendering time public is not something that happens only occasionally and after-the-fact. On the contrary, because Dasein *qua* ekstatico-temporal *is* already disclosed, and because this entails understanding and explication – for these reasons, time has already become public in con-

cern itself. We order ourselves *in accordance with it* – so it has to be something that anybody can run across."

In the right margin:

?

412.16–21 **412.12–17** **465.6–11** **378.35–40**

Text in SZ:

" 'Public time' turns out to be the kind of time 'in which' we encounter the inner-worldly, whether it be useful or just-there. That is why we have to designate such non-Dasein entities as '*within-time*.' The interpretation of within-time-ness gives us a more original insight into the essence of 'public time' and also makes it possible to define its 'being.' "

In the left margin:

But this is intersubjective identical time.

§ 81
Within-time-ness and the Genesis of the Ordinary Conception of Time

422.27–28 **422.24–25** **474.32–33** **387.11**

Text in SZ:

"The ordinary conception of time *covers up* [datability and significance]."

In the left margin:

Why should it be a covering up?

423.1–4 **422.36–423.1** **475.6–9** **387.24–27**

Text in SZ:

"Now insofar as *this* concern with time returns to the co-understood time itself and 'considers' it, it sees 'nows' (which indeed are also somehow 'there') within the horizon of the understanding of being that constantly guides this concern."

In the right margin:

?

423.4–5 **423.1–2** **475.10–11** **387.27–29**

Text in SZ:

"Thus the 'nows' are *just-there together* in some way or other: that is, we encounter not only entities *but also* the 'nows.' "

In the margin:

which, however, is not some illusion [*Schein*].

423.10–15 **423.7–12** **475.16–21** **387.33–38**

Text in SZ:

"The ordinary interpretation of world-time as now-time lacks the horizon whereby it could make accessible such things as world, significance, and datability. These structures are necessarily covered up, all the more so because the ordinary explication of time reinforces this cover-up by the way it conceptually unfolds its characterization of time."

In the right margin:

What kind of an objection is this? Doesn't constitutive analysis lead us to all of that?

423.32–37 **423.29–33** **476.3–8** **388.12–17**

Text in SZ:

"The specific structure of world-time has to remain *covered up* because it too is *stretched out* along with ekstatically founded datability. The stretched-out-ness of time does not get understood in terms of the horizonal *extendedness* of the ekstatical unity of the temporality that has turned public in the [ordinary] concern with time."

In the right margin, next to "world-time" in the first sentence:

of world-time?

Let us name the same thing as Heidegger does.[171]

424.1–4 **423.35–424.2** **476.11–15** **388.17–22**

Text in SZ:

"The fact that every now, no matter how brief, is an *always-already*-now has to be understood in terms of the *still* 'earlier,' – i.e., the ekstatic extendedness of temporality – whence every now arises. This ekstatic extendedness is both foreign to the continuity of the just-there and yet the condition of possibility for access to anything that is continuously just-there."

In the left margin:

As if the "ordinary" view of time did not have its original legitimacy, which does not disappear in the least through constitutive analysis.[172]

424.5–10 **424.3–8** **476.16–21** **388.23–27**

Text in SZ:

"The leveling-down and covering-up of world-time, and hence of temporality in general, that is operative in the ordinary interpretion of time is strikingly revealed in its main thesis: that time is 'endless.' The ordinary interpretation usually takes time as an uninterrupted sequence of 'nows,' and likewise every 'now' is either a 'just-now' or a 'soon-to-be.' "

---

[171] Of these two sentences of Husserl's, the first clearly relates to the first of Heidegger's two German sentences. What the second sentence refers to is less clear.

[172] See Husserl's note at *SZ-1* 426.19–21 = *SZ-15* 426.14–16 = *BT-1* 478.32–34 = *BT-2* 390.22–24.

In the left margin:

Why leveling-down and covering-up? I contest that.

In the right margin, a large

?

424.17–19 424.14–16 476.29–30 388.33–35

Text in SZ:

"This thesis about time becomes possible only if one is oriented *towards the ungrounded 'in-itself-ness' of a stream of just-there 'nows.'* "

In the left margin:

?

424.27–28 424.23–24 476.39–477.1 388.42–43

Text in SZ:

"But what is this leveling-down of world-time and this covering-up of temporality grounded in?"

In the left margin:

?!

425.1–4 424.35–37 477.12–14 389.10–12

Text in SZ:

"And because the ordinary understanding of Dasein is guided by the Everyone, the self-forgetful 'representation' of the 'endlessness' of public time can be solidified."

In the right margin:

But the Everyone is also intersubjectivity.

425.19–21 425.14–17 477.29–32 389.27–29

Text in SZ:

"Time goes on, just the way it already 'was' when someone 'entered life.' The only time one knows is the public time that has been leveled off and that belongs to everybody and hence to nobody."

In the right margin:

But isn't this correct? and does time have a general meaning different from this natural one?

425.26–27 425.22–23 478.1–2 389.33–35

Text in SZ:

"Why do we say: Time *passes* and not with *equal* emphasis: Time arises?"

In the right margin:

We do say that time comes.

425.41–426.1 **425.36–37** **478.16–17** **390.4–5**

Text in SZ (all italicized):

"Dasein knows 'time flies' in terms of its 'fleeting' knowledge of its death."

In the right margin:

?

426.1–5 **425.37–41** **478.17–20** **390.5–7**

Text in SZ:

"Talk that emphasizes the passing of time is a dim public reflection of the *finite becoming* that characterizes Dasein's temporality."

In the left margin:

?

426.13–16 **426.7–11** **478.26–29** **390.16–19**

Text in SZ:

"The impossibility of a reversal [in the flow of the now-sequence] is based on the fact that public time derives from temporality, whose emergence (insofar as temporality is primarily a matter of becoming) 'goes' ekstatically straight to its end, such that it 'is' already *at* its end."

In the left margin:

Is this a concrete way of speaking?

426.19–21 **426.14–16** **478.32–34** **390.22–24**

Text in SZ:

"*The ordinary representation of time has its natural legitimacy.* It belongs to Dasein's everyday kind of being, and to the usually dominant understanding of being."

In the left margin:

After what was presented above, this is surprising.[173]

[173] See Husserl's note on the legitimacy of the ordinary view of time, at *SZ-1* 424.1–4 = *SZ-15* 423.35–424.2 = *BT-1* 476.11–15 = *BT-2* 388.17–22.

§ 82
The Contrast between the Eksistential-ontological Connection of Temporality, Dasein, and World-time, and Hegel's Conception of the Connection Between Time and Spirit

a. Hegel's Conception of Time

428.30 428.27 480.32 392.15

Text in SZ:

[Title of the Sub-section:] **a. Hegel's Conception of Time**

In the left margin:

I am able to learn nothing here, and seriously, is there anything here to learn at all?

433.15–17 433.11–14 484.18–20 395.9–11

Text in SZ:

"This 'absolute negativity' furnishes a logically formalized interpretation of Descartes' '*cogito me cogitare rem*,' which is how Descartes views the essence of *conscientia*."

In the right margin:

N.B.

§ 83
The Eksistential-Temporal Analytic of Dasein, and the Fundamental-Ontological Question of the Meaning of Being in General

436.34–38 436. 27–31 487.8–11 397.20–23

Text in SZ:

"...: Philosophy 'is universal phenomenological ontology,[174] growing out of a hermeneutics of Dasein, and this hermeneutics, as an analytic of *ek-sistence*, has tied the Ariadne's Thread of all philosophical questioning to the place from which that questioning *arises* and to which it *returns*.' "

In the left margin:

N.B.[175]

---

[174] At this point in *SZ-1* the text bears a comma that is absent from *SZ-1* 38.18–25, from which Heidegger takes the present passage.

[175] Above, at *SZ-1* 38.18–25 = *SZ-15* 38.18–24 = *BT-1* 62.29–35 = *BT-2* 34.6–12 (where the above text first appears) a note by Husserl refers ahead to the present passage, while erroneously citing it as p. "430."

437.9–15 437.3–9 487.21–26 397.32–37

Text in SZ:

"We have long known that ancient ontology works with 'thing-concepts' and runs the risk of 'reifying consciousness.' But what does 'reifying' mean? Where does it come from? Exactly why is being 'usually' 'conceptualized' in terms of the just-there *and not* in terms of the useful? Why does this reifying always return to dominate?"

Husserl underlines:

known

In the left margin:

in words!

In the right margin:

N.B.

437.19–21 437.13–15 487.30–32 397.41–398.2

Text in SZ:

"And can we even *seek* the answer as long as the *question* of the meaning of being remains unformulated and unclarified?"

In the left margin:

?

In the right margin:

?!

437.25–33 437.19–26 487.36–488.2 398.6–12

Text in SZ:

"We must seek a *path* towards clarifying the fundamental question of ontology, and we must *follow* that path. Whether it is the only path, or even the right one, can be decided only *after taking it*. The conflict over the interpretation of being cannot be settled *because it has yet to be stirred up*. And ultimately it is not the kind of fight that you can just 'pick' but, rather, one that requires a good deal of preparation even to stir up. The present investigation has merely *started along that path*. So, how does it stand?"

In the right margin, next to the first sentence:

N.B.!!

In the left margin, a very large

N.B.

End of Husserl's
Marginalia to *Being and Time*

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN MARTIN HEIDEGGER, *KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF METAPHYSICS*

Translated by Richard E. Palmer

AN INTRODUCTION TO HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN *KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF METAPHYSICS*

Richard E. Palmer[1]

Husserl's marginal remarks in *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* clearly do not reflect the same intense effort to penetrate Heidegger's thought that we find in his marginal notes in *Sein und Zeit*. Merely in terms of length, Husserl's comments in the published German text occupy only one-third the number of pages.[2] Pages 1–5, 43–121, and 125–167[3] contain no reading marks at all – over half of the 236 pages of *KPM*. This suggests that Husserl either read these pages with no intention of returning to the text or skipped large parts of the middle of the text altogether.[4] His remarks often express frustration or a resigned recognition of the now unbridgeable, irrevocable gap between himself and Heidegger.

Yet these remarks in the margins of *KPM* are still of considerable interest for several reasons: *First*, many of Husserl's notations respond substantively and at length to Heidegger's text and dispute his statements, articulating a clear counterposition to that of Heidegger on many points. This introduction, after the present paragraph, will devote itself to spelling out this counterposition. *Second*, Husserl's notations are important because of *when* they were

---

[1] I wish to thank Roland Breeur of the Husserl-Archives for his gracious help in choosing relevant parts from my essay, "Husserl's Debate with Heidegger in the Margins of *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, to introduce my translation here. That essay can be found in *Man and World,* 30 (April–May 1997): 5–33.

[2] "Randbemerkungen Husserls zu Heideggers *Sein und Zeit* and *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* " in *Husserl Studies* 11, 1–2 (1994), 3–63. This text contains only Husserl's remarks and not the Heideggerian reference texts included here. In it, the marginal remarks on *SZ* occupy pages 9–48, while the notes on *KPM* take up only pages 49–63. A French translation, Edmund Husserl, *Notes sur Heidegger* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1993), is available which also contains the earlier drafts of the *Britannica* article and an interpretive essay by Denise Souche-Dagues, "La lecture husserlienne de *Sein und Zeit,*" pp. 119–152.

[3] Page references in this introduction will be to the original first edition text. Our translation of the marginal notes can serve as a guide for corresponding pages in the English translation by Richard Taft and in the 5th edition of the German text.

[4] The "Einleitung" by Roland Breeur for the "Randbemerkungen" in *Husserl Studies* cited above, pp. 3–8, notes that we have no way of knowing whether Husserl ever read these other parts of the text. Breeur helpfully divides Husserl's remarks in *SZ* and *KPM* into three categories, the first of which is basically index words to tag the content of a passage for future reference. He notes that there are very few notes of this type in *KPM* but quite a few in *SZ,* showing that Husserl read *SZ* much more analytically than *KPM.*

written. Probably dating from Husserl's vacation at Tremezzo in September of 1929, they come from a time when Husserl has fully realized Heidegger's apostasy and is trying to arrive at a realistic assessment of his own position and relation to Heidegger. To do this, he devotes himself to both *Sein und Zeit* and *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik,* which had appeared only a couple of months before.[5] A *third* basis for the significance of Husserl's notations in *KPM* resides in the fact that Heidegger saw *KPM* as a continuation of the project of his masterwork, *Sein und Zeit.* Of course, Heidegger shortly thereafter abandoned any plans to finish *SZ* and its project of a "fundamental ontology,"[6] although he never abandoned his quest for "the meaning of Being." Prepared and published immediately on the heels of his famous "Davos Lectures" with Ernst Cassirer, *KPM* represents a certain closure in Heidegger's dialogue with NeoKantianism, and by extension with the NeoKantian tendencies in Husserl's phenomenology.[7] Husserl's response to this view of Kant and continuation of *SZ* is of interest. Indeed, this brings us to a *fourth* reason why Husserl's marginal remarks here are relevant: because of the importance of the philosopher Kant for *both* Husserl and Heidegger. Yet Kant had a very different significance for the two thinkers. For Heidegger in *KPM,* Kant's analysis of categorial intuition in the First Critique offered new possibilities for extending his ontological analysis of *Being and Time.*[8] For Husserl, on the other hand, Kant's First Critique is a treatise in epistemology, not of fundamental ontology or of metaphysics, as Heidegger argued. For Husserl it was Descartes rather than Kant who was the truly decisive thinker in modern philosophy; Kant had failed to fulfill even the promise of his own transcendental philosophy. This belated fulfillment was the aim of Husserl's own transcendental phenomenology.[9] *Fifth,* we are able, because *KPM* is an obvious example of

---

[5] For more exact details of the chronology, see the main introduction by Tom Sheehan.

[6] Ironically, Heidegger states in the preface to the fourth edition (1973) that he undertook *KPM* precisely because he saw by 1929 that the Being-question as put forward in *SZ* was misunderstood. A little later in the same preface, he says that the Being-question was also misunderstood as it appeared in *KPM,* so he abandoned the project of using a reinterpretation of traditional metaphysics as a means profiling the question of Being.

[7] Regarding Heidegger's relation to Husserl's phenomenology in the Marburg years, consult the following: Walter Biemel, "Heideggers Stellung zur Phänomenologie in der Marburger Zeit," in *Husserl, Scheler, Heidegger in der Sicht neuer Quellen,* ed. E. W. Orth (Freiburg: Alber, 1978), 141–223; Franco Volpi, "Heidegger in Marburg: Die Auseinandersetzung mit Husserl," *Philosophischer Literaturanzeiger* 34 (1984): 48–69; and Karl Schuhmann, "Zu Heideggers *Spiegel*-Gespräch über Husserl, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 32 (1978): 591–612. Also see Theodore Kisiel's *The Genesis of* **Being and Time** (Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1993) and John van Buren's *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of a Hidden King* (Bloomington: Indiana U. Press, 1994).

[8] For a detailed tracing of Heidegger's changing relation to and interpretation of Kant, see Hansgeorg Hoppe, "Wandlungen in der Kant-Auffassung Heideggers," pp. 284–317 in *Durchblicke: Martin Heidegger zum 80. Geburtstag,* ed. V. Klostermann. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1970. See also the important documents that were added to the *GA* publication of *KPM* : *GA* 3:249–311.

[9] For Husserl's evolving relation to Kant, see Iso Kern's *Husserl und Kant: Eine Untersuchung über Husserls Verhältnis zu Kant und zum Neukantianismus* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964), 471pp.

Heidegger's method of *Destruktion* or "decontruction," to find in Husserl's remarks a reaction and comment on this interpretive strategy. *Finally*, because these remarks were never intended for publication but rather represent a dialogue of Husserl with himself, he is fully free to be frank. Thus, they give us an especially candid access to his thoughts and feelings at the time.[10]

What do we learn from reading Husserl's marginal notations in *KPM*? We see, first of all, that Husserl is clearly no longer seeking a compromise or reconciliation with Heideggerian philosophy. The task at hand is that of understanding Heidegger's position as an alternative to his own. We find Husserl liberally sprinkling question marks, exclamation points, and *nota benes* in the margins as he reads, but leaving large sections in the middle of the book with no marginal comments at all. Sometimes the remarks are sarcastic and bitter, as he points out inconsistencies in Heidegger's argument or finds Heidegger using terms he has elsewhere avoided; mostly, however, Husserl's notes articulate a single, consistent counterposition to that taken by Heidegger, basically the counterposition of his transcendental phenomenology. To that counterposition, articulated as a reaction to Heidegger's *KPM*, we now turn. That counterposition will emerge as a response to six of the issues discussed by Heidegger. By no means are these the only issues on which Husserl comments, but examining them will give us a clear sense of Husserl's counterposition.

The first issue may be posed as a question: *What is the philosophical significance of Kant?* Heidegger makes his view quite clear in the preface to *KPM* when he asserts: "This investigation is devoted to interpreting Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* as *laying the ground for metaphysics*, and thus placing the problem of metaphysics before us *as fundamental ontology*" (emphasis added [hereafter: e.a.]). Otto Pöggeler rightly notes that Heidegger's approach in this volume represented a clear challenge to the whole NeoKantian interpretation of Kant as an epistemologist.[11] Indeed, Heidegger goes so far as to assert bluntly in *KPM* (16)[12] that the First Critique "has nothing to do with a 'theory of knowledge'," and later he notes Kant's reference to the First Critique in a letter as a "metaphysics of metaphysics." This, he says, "should strike down every effort to search for a 'theory of knowledge' in the *Critique of Pure Reason*" (221).

---

[10] There is now, of course, an outstanding edition of the correspondence. See E. Husserl, *Briefwechsel.* 10 vols. Edited by Karl Schuhmann in cooperation with Elisabeth Schuhmann (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1993–1994). For a number of sometimes frank and salty comments in Husserl's correspondence, see R. Breeur's "Einleitung" to the *Husserl Studies* publication in German of the marginalia in *SZ* and *KPM*: 11, 1–2 (1994): 5–6.

[11] See *Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers*, 4th rev. ed. (Pfullingen: Neske, 1994), especially pp. 80–87.

[12] Page references here are to the first edition of *KPM*. The corresponding pages in the English translation by Richard Taft or in the German 5th edition may be determined by referring to the comparative pages given in our translation of Husserl's marginal remarks.

Husserl's very first verbal remark in the book, on p. 10 – "*Seinsplan?*" ["plan of Being?"] – takes note of the fact that Heidegger is already interpreting Kant's Critique as, interpretively transforming it into, a work of fundamental ontology. Two pages later Husserl asks in the margin: "What does *Seinsverfassung* [constitution of Being] mean?" (12). Husserl seems here to be objecting to a certain vaporousness in ontology as such, to the difficulty of determining phenomenologically things such as the "constitution of Being." For Husserl, Kant is doing epistemology, not fundamental ontology, and thus he protests against Heidegger's interpretation in the margin: "But one must glean Kant's meaning! There I read a quite different meaning!" (11). Husserl felt Kant was moving in the right direction to look for the *transcendental* conditions for the possibility of knowledge, but the presuppositions of his time prevented him from being able to establish an adequate foundation for scientific knowledge.[13] And behind the two radically contrasting interpretations of the philosophy of Kant we also find two quite different visions of philosophy itself. One sees philosophy as a quest for Being and the other seeing it as "*strenge Wissenschaft*" – rigorous science. With regard to the remaining five issues to be considered, we will try to show that and how each issue is rooted in the contrasting views Husserl and Heidegger took of philosophy and its mission.

The second issue has to do with Heidegger's discussion of *the "finitude of human knowledge"* as discussed in §5. Here Heidegger, originally a theology student, follows Kant in comparing the supposed mode of divine knowing as originary and creative, an intuition that is *intuitus originarius*, with human knowledge as the reception into knowledge of something whose nature one did not oneself create. This Kant calls *intuitus derivativus*. But Heidegger notes here also a moment of "*finite transcendence*," in that human knowing gains access to something other than itself, something of which it had no prior knowledge and did not create. This process, the "veritative synthesis," involves the synthesis of intuition and thought by which a thing "becomes manifest" as what it is. Heidegger finds in Kant's close analysis of this synthesis a more nuanced description of what he had in *SZ* connected with "the ontological comprehension of Being," the hermeneutical *as,* and his definition of phenomenology as "letting something appear from itself." Small wonder, then, that William Richardson, in his lengthy study, *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*, devotes a 55-page chapter to *KPM,* calling it "the most authoritative interpretation of *Being and Time*," and referring to the last section of *KPM* "the best propaedeutic" to that work.[14] For Heidegger, Kant

[13] See his "Kant und die Idee der transzendentale Philosophie (1924)," in *Erste Philosophie I (1923–1924)*, Husserliana vol. VII: 230–287, especially 280–287.

[14] (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1962), p. 106.

was doing ontology without specifically calling it that – indeed, "fundamental ontology." To recover this ontological dimension was his reason for returning to Kant, and this kind of interpretation is proper to the mission of philosophy itself.

Husserl, for his part, sprinkles the second page of section 5 with half a dozen marginal comments, putting a question mark next to Heidegger's reference to "a new concept of sensibility which is *ontological* rather than *sensualistic*" (24, e.a.). Alongside Heidegger's assertion that "knowledge is primarily intuition, *i.e.*, [is] a representing that immediately represents the being itself" (24), Husserl asks, "Is this Kant?" – "the *Ding-an-sich*?" As for God, says Husserl in the margin, "God needs no explicative intuition, no step-by-step getting to know things . . . no fixation in language, etc. – *but such a God is an absurdity*" (26, e.a.). For Husserl, the contrast with an infinite creative intuition is not only unnecessary but also confusing and phenomenologically impossible. Alongside Heidegger's suggestion that the active dimension of finite understanding shows us the nature of absolute knowledge as originating intuition, Husserl writes: "Nonsense. Finitude is not absolute" (27). Husserl in this section uses the word "absurd" three times before he concludes, "This matter is and remains absurd" (31). For Husserl, when Heidegger speculates about the mode of God's knowing in contrast with human knowing, he is emphasizing just those dimensions of Kant that prevented Kant from making his transcendental philosophy into a rigorous science, which is what Husserl thought philosophy ought to be.

A third issue on which Husserl takes sharp issue with Heidegger has to do with what Heidegger calls "*the ontological synthesis*" – including a "*knowledge of the Being of beings*" *prior to all understanding and acting in the world* (34, e.a.). The "ontological synthesis" is what bridges the gap between the prior understanding of Being and the being of the thing known. Indeed, for Heidegger, it is the *vehicle* of "finite transcendence." Alongside Heidegger's sentence, "We are inquiring into the *essential possibility* of the *ontological synthesis* (38, e.a.)," Husserl attempts to reframe the discussion in more phenomenological terms as "the invariant structural form of the pre-given world." Again, the issue is whether Kant is doing ontology or epistemology. Says Husserl: "One *need not* begin with traditional ontology; one can pose the question as Hume did before Kant. One *does not need* the problem of finitude either" (38, e.a.) When Heidegger goes on to assert that the finite human Dasein "*needs*" the ontological synthesis "*in order to exist as Dasein*," Husserl underlines these words and asks: "*But is this the right way to pose the question philosophically?* Isn't here an entity already presupposed whereby the presupposed Being already presupposes subjectivity? Is not man himself already pre-given, etc.? . . . This is already Heidegger." As Husserl sees it, one does not need to posit infinite knowledge in order to describe the finite proc-

esses of human knowledge; human existence does not require some kind of "ontological synthesis" to enable it to take place; one "does not need" ontology, period. What Heidegger is doing is ontologizing Kant the epistemologist. And when Heidegger starts to describe what Dasein needs "in order to exist as Dasein," Husserl suspects that a good deal of anthropologizing is going on in *KPM* and also in *SZ*.

A fourth major issue between Husserl and Heidegger in the margins of *KPM* is *the nature of the transcendental self. How is such a self to be conceived?* According to Heidegger in *Being and Time*, both Descartes and Kant wrongly thought of the famous "I am" in terms of a static metaphysics of presence, while Heidegger wanted to see Dasein as a factical, temporally existing entity. As Heidegger saw it, Husserl in his 1907 lectures on internal time consciousness had already taken a step beyond Kant in making time a definitive factor in consciousness. And now here in the Kantbook, Heidegger goes further to credit Kant with showing that the shaping power of the imagination is temporal; indeed, says Heidegger, imagination "must first of all shape time itself. *Only when we realize this do we have a full concept of time*" (167). For Heidegger, time and human finitude, are keys to a more adequate fundamental ontology, and it is important to make them also *the essential core of the self*. For Husserl, the transcendental ego functions as the philosophically necessary anchor of his phenomenology. In order to be transcendental, Husserl's transcendental ego would need in a certain sense to transcend at least ontic time. Interestingly, at this point Husserl instead of differing with Heidegger on the temporality of the ego seems to be trying hard to understand what Heidegger is saying. Husserl in the margin refers to "the immanent *life* of the ego" and asks: "Is the ego the immanent time in which objective time temporalizes itself?" (184), as if he were trying here principally to grasp Heidegger's concept. Later, for instance, he writes in the margin, as if paraphrasing: "The immanent life of the ego as, rather, originally temporalizing" (187). It would seem here he is merely restating what he understands to be Heidegger's point, for he concedes, "an immanent temporal horizon [of the ego] is necessary" (186). What Husserl may be saying is: Time is of course an essential component of the transcendental ego; what baffles me is all this talk about what time is "primordially"! What is the "primordial essence" of time? Why is it so important here? Heidegger's answer to this question comes in the next section, where he states, "Primordial time *makes possible* the transcendental power of the imagination (188). But here Husserl underlines "makes possible" and asks: "What does this 'makes possible' mean?" For Husserl, Heidegger is not describing the experience of time phenomenologically, or even accounting for it philosophically; rather, he is doing metaphysics and bringing Kant along with him. Yes of course there is an immanent temporal horizon for transcendental subjectivity, says Husserl, but how does that make

the transcendental ego into "time itself"? Not only is Heidegger's language strange here, he also seems to be making philosophical assumptions or claims about the metaphysical nature of Dasein, which raises the issue of the nature of man, and more pointedly for Husserl of philosophical anthropology as a basis for philosophy. Maybe Heidegger here is really doing philosophical anthropology, Husserl thinks; in any case, he is not doing phenomenology, again not doing what philosophy today ought to be doing.

A fifth issue that arises with regard to Heidegger's interpretation in *KPM* is that of *interpretive violence*. Heidegger asserts: "Every interpretation, if it wants to wring from what the words say what they *want* to say, must use *violence*. Such violence, however cannot simply be a roving arbitrariness. *The power of an idea that sheds advance light* must drive and lead the explication" (193–194, e.a.). Husserl underlines the words "every interpretation must must violence" and puts three exclamation points and three question marks – his maximum. Husserl is astonished, we can assume, at Heidegger's provocative statement, and even Heidegger hastens to qualify it in the next sentence. In the margin Husserl writes, "I differentiate between what they wanted to say and what they untimately aimed at and wanted to say as they were said" (193). Interestingly, Husserl himself had elsewhere earlier argued that Kant was constrained by the thought-forms of his time, so he could not carry through the founding of a truly rigorous transcendental philosophy.[15] This claim would seem to parallel Heidegger's deconstruction in suggesting this was what Kant really wanted to say.

But the larger issue at stake here is Heidegger's whole project of *Destruktion,* of uncovering what has been repressed and forgotten in Western philosophy since Plato. In other words, we again have to do with a quite different vision of philosophy and its mission. For Heidegger, philosophizing meant seeking out of the "primordial roots" of Western thought, "restoring" to thought what had been "forgotten" or only preserved in a Latinized distortion, as in the case of Aristotle's *ousia* becoming *substantia*. As Heidegger later put it, philosophy is really "a thoughtful conversation between thinkers," obviously an endeavor more hermeneutical and dialogical than rigorously scientific and verifiable. Philosophy for Husserl, on the other hand, was supposed to involve rigorous logical and scientific reflection, purifying one's thinking of unreflected presuppositions and establishing a philosophical foundation for further work, in order to achieve "results" that would be universally acceptable scientificially. Such a vision of philosophy makes quite clear Husserl's continuity with the Enlightenment faith in reason as able to overcome religious dogma and other baseless inherited assumptions.

Among the many remaining issues disputed by Husserl in the margins of

[15] See his comments on Kant in *Erste Philosophie I*, cited above.

KPM, probably the most important is *philosophical anthropology*, an issue that looms large in the last part of *KPM*: This will serve as our sixth and final issue on which Husserl and Heidegger take contrasting positions. As a matter of fact, over half of Husserl's marginal comments in *KPM* occur in its last forty pages, whose three subsections are clearly related to the issue of the status of a philosophical anthropology: (1) "the question of whether in this retrieve of Kant *metaphysics could be grounded in man*," (2) the significance of "*the finitude of man in relation to the metaphysics of Dasein*," and (3) "*the metaphysics of Dasein as fundamental ontology*."[16] At the beginning of this part, Heidegger takes note of the fact that Kant says that his famous questions, "What can I know? What ought I do? and What may I hope?" are all summed up in his fourth question: "*What is man?* " For Heidegger this point raises the issue of whether a philosophical anthropology could serve as the foundation of metaphysics, or metaphysics serve as the foundation of anthropology. Heidegger does observe that anthropology seems to be "a fundamental tendency of man's contemporary position with respect to himself and the totality of beings" (199), but this does not mean he is happy about it. What man needs is to work out philosophically, says Heidegger, is "man's place in the cosmos," a topic on which his friend, the late Max Scheler, to whom *KPM* is dedicated, had contributed a well-known book.[17] In Husserl's view, the goal of philosophy is not a matter of working out a "worldview," and he here explicitly classes Heidegger with Scheler and Dilthey as following "the anthropological line of thought" (199). When Heidegger asks, "If anthropology in a certain sense gathers into itself all the central questions of philosophy, why do these allow us to follow them back to the question of what man is? (203), Husserl underlines this sentence and writes in the margin, "It is just this that is not correct"! Heidegger himself very shortly thereafter concedes that the "indeterminate character" of philosophical anthropology makes it unsuited for "fundamental questioning." Essentially, Heidegger and Husserl both reject an anthropological basis for philosophy. But still Heidegger takes Dasein and the *Seinsverständnis* [comprehension of Being] of Dasein as the foundation for his inquiry into the meaning of Being. Thus when Heidegger asserts that "the understanding of Being" is something "which we all as human beings already and constantly understand" (216), it provokes a lengthy reply from Husserl: "We already experience the world, we already make claims about the world, ...we experience ourselves as humans in the world.... But we get bogged down in difficulties *through subjective reflection*" (e.a.). Husserl certainly agrees that there is a pregiven world and we need to describe that world, but the

[16] These headings are found in the table of contents as well as the beginning pages of Part 4.

[17] *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos* (1929). Bern: Francke, 7th ed. 1966. In English: *Man's Place in the Cosmos.*

method for doing this is phenomenology, not "subjective reflection." Later on the same page he writes, "It is not by pursuing the possibility of the concept of Being, but rather pursuing the possibility of doing away with the bewilderments in which the world as 'world for us' has entangled us and also every entity whatever as entity for us" (216). And in the margin of the next page he writes, pungently: "The obscurity of the meaning of the *Seiendem* [the being or existent thing] is really the unclarity about how the essence of the being or thing is to be held free of the incongruities which stem from subjective reflection." So while Heidegger offers fundamental ontology as his alternative to anthropology, Husserl finds in Heidegger's analysis of Dasein's preconceptual comprehension of Being only an anthropology disguised as ontology. For Husserl, Heidegger's analysis of preconceptual understanding of Being is not the product of true phenomenological investigation and description, and it creates rather than eliminates obscurity. So when Heidegger asserts, "We understand Being, but as yet we lack the concept," Husserl exclaims, "We lack it? When would we need it?" For Husserl, it was an irrelevant, unnecessary quest. The quest Heidegger so ardently pursued for the meaning Being, a quest that dominated his philosophical life, leading him later into the philosophy of Nietzsche, into reflection on the "origin" of the work of art, into explicating the poetry of Hölderlin and down "forest paths" without end, Husserl would say – had he lived to see it – was a dead end, only a way of getting bogged down in subjective reflection instead of making a solid and positive contribution to philosophy.

In conclusion, we have here in Heidegger's position and Husserl's counterposition two quite different visions of philosophy and its mission, and also of man – two very different sensibilities and sets of loyalties. One vision seems to have affinities with metaphysical speculation and theology, Heidegger's earliest study, while the other seems to long for the sureness of mathematical certainty, Husserl's earliest field of investigation. Heidegger saw himself as overhauling the whole Western tradition of metaphysics, while Husserl felt that what philosophy was called upon to do at the moment was to analyze "the crisis of the European sciences." Philosophy as he saw it should have a facilitating and not merely critical relationship to science. True, both thinkers saw themselves as making a "new beginning," but the two beginnings were quite different. Heidegger's "neue Anfang" was another term for the *Kehre* [turn], truly the end of all connection to Husserlian thought. This "new beginning" led him to turn away even from the fundamental ontology of *Being and Time* and eventually to "forest paths"; Husserl's "new beginning" was phenomenology, which he referred to as a "breakthrough" in the *Britannica* article, an invention and method that offered new access to "the things themselves" but never left behind the larger community of careful, scientific thinking.

Husserl poignantly remarks in a marginal note in *KPM* that he could not see

why subjectivity, especially a purified transcendental subjectivity, was an unacceptable basis for phenomenology – and by extension for philosophical investigation. To the very end, Husserl felt that Heidegger had never understood what he meant by transcendental subjectivity and the importance of going back to the transcendental ego. For Heidegger, Dasein was not just another name for human subjectivity but a way of avoiding the concept of subjectivity itself. As the later essays, like the "The Age of the World Picture" (1938) and the "Letter on Humanism" (1946) make quite explicit, Heidegger could not make subjectivity, even a "transcendental" subjectivity, the anchor of his reflection. Husserl's marginal notes vividly show us his deep disappointment, even outrage, at Heidegger's desertion, but they never abandon the horizon of subjectivity, the vision of philosophy as rigorous science, and the quest for a reliable grounding for knowledge. His remarks in the margins of *KPM* all testify to this vision of philosophy, a vision Husserl more and more realized that Heidegger did not share and really had never shared.

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN *KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF METAPHYSICS*

translated by Richard E. Palmer

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

Description of Source Text

The remarks of Husserl published here may be found in the margins of his copy of Martin Heidegger's *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik,* Bonn, Cohen, 1929 (Format 23 x 16 cm) XII, 236pp., which is presently held by the Husserl-Archives at Louvain, Belgium. The book carries a hand-written inscription from Heidegger as well as a monogram from the library of Husserl. Numerous places are marked with underlinings, vertical or slanted lines, exclamation marks, and reminder notations, such as NB (*nota bene*), or with question-marks and wavy lines added. Husserl's marks and remarks are mostly in pencil but sometimes written with a blue pen.

General Editing Principles for this Edition of Husserl's Marginal Notations

1. The notation is in Husserl's own handwriting, unless otherwise indicated. When provided here, the passage in *KPM* to which Husserl seems to be referring will be given first, in quotation marks, followed by Husserl's notations: underlinings of words and marks or remarks in the margin.
2. What is represented here was written in pencil, and all remarks other than question marks or exclamation points, are normally in shorthand. The shorthand was transcribed by Steven Spileers of the Husserl-Archives.
3. Along with the words in shorthand, exclamation-marks and question-marks will also be noted. Mere underlinings or emphasis marks without a further remark, exclamation- or question-marks will for the most part not be indicated.

4. Location will be indicated by the page and nearest line number(s) in Heidegger's *KPM*. Locations in three editions will be given: *First*, the location of the remark or notation in Husserl's copy of *KPM* now held in the Husserl-Archives at Louvain; *second*, the corresponding page and line numbers for the fifth [enlarged] edition of 1991, which is identical to Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 3; and *third*, the location in the English translation by Richard Taft (Indiana University Press, 1990). When Husserl underlines words in a sentence or comments on a sentence (but not in cases where there is only a question mark), we will quote part or all of the sentence of *KPM* to which he is referring. Heidegger's emphasis on certain words will be shown through wide-spacing, which is how he indicated emphasis in the original German text. Much of the wide-spacing emphasis was deleted in the 5th edition and *GA* 3, but since Husserl is referring to the first edition, it will be retained. In estimating line numbers, each line of a heading or caption will count as a line as well as each line in the text itself.
5. Information inserted into the text by the editor will generally be given within pointed brackets < >; square brackets [ ] will generally be used to supply the reader with the source word, phrase, or pronoun to be found in the German text.

Note: The publication of these marginal remarks of Husserl is carried out with the permission of the Husserl-Archives in Louvain, and under their direction. The translator is also grateful to Professor Dr. Dominic Kaegi of the Philosophisches Seminar, Heidelberg, for his review and corrections of this translation, as well as Steven Spileers and Ms. I. Lombaerts of the Husserl-Archives at Louvain for helpful corrections and suggestions. Permission from Indiana University Press to cite Richard Taft's translation of the *KPM* is also gratefully acknowledged, although I have felt free to make minor changes in wording.

HUSSERL'S MARGINAL REMARKS IN *KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF METAPHYSICS*

Notations on the Pre-Paginated Parts of the Volume

1. Inner Blank Page

On the front-side of the inner blank page, upper right, the signature: D-7

2. Title Page

At upper right, the signature: E. Husserl

Next to this, the signature: D - 7

In the middle of the page in Heidegger's handwriting: Mit herzlichem Gruß. M. Heidegger [With heartfelt greetings. M. Heidegger]

[There are no markings in the first section, titled
"Introduction: The Theme and Structure of the Investigation,"
after which is found the following thematic caption or subtitle, then Part One:]

THE UNFOLDING OF THE IDEA OF A FUNDAMENTAL ONTOLOGY THROUGH THE INTERPRETATION OF THE *CRITIQUE OF PURE REASON* AS A LAYING OF THE GROUND FOR METAPHYSICS

Part One
The Starting Point for the Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics

§1. The Traditional Concept of Metaphysics

Page and Line Reference
1st ed. 5th ed. Taft trans.

6.12 **7.13** **4.27**
Text in KPM: "In subsequent Scholastic Philosophy (Logic, Physics, Ethics), there was no discipline or framework in which to insert precisely what Aristotle strove for here as πρωτη φιλοσοφια, as authentic[1] philosophy."
Husserl underlines the word "authentic."
In the margin: ?

§2. The Point of Departure for the Laying of the Ground for Traditional Metaphysics.

10.7 **11.6** **7.20**
Text in KPM: "This preliminary plan of the Being of beings is inscribed within the basic concepts and principles of the Science of Nature."
In the margin: Plan of Being? [*Seinsplan?*]

10.28–29 **11.26–27** **7.38–39**
Text in KPM: "This is the problem of the nature of prior understanding of Being, that is, of ontological knowledge in the widest sense."
In the margin: But *Erkenntnis* [knowledge, cognition] is <supposedly> a bad word.

[1] <In the 1st edition, Heidegger has "authentic [*eigentliches*] philosophizing" instead of "authentic [*eigentliche*] philosophy" as in the fifth edition.>

11.4 **12.1** **8.3**
Text in KPM: "With the laying of the ground for metaphysics . . . Kant is immediately brought into the dialogue with Aristotle and Plato."
In the margin: ? And Hume and Leibniz?

12.1 **12.33** **8.29**
Text in KPM: "We must attempt to find out whether we might progress better in the tasks of metaphysics if we assume that objects must conform to our knowledge [*Erkenntnis*]."
In the margin: *Erkenntnis* [Knowledge] ?

11,ftnt. **12,ftnt.** **8,ftnt.**
Text in KPM: "9. <Kant,> *Über die Fortschritte*, p. 302."
In the margin: Yes, but one must glean Kant's meaning [*Kant nachlesen*] !? There I read a quite different meaning.

12.9 **13.5** **8.29**
In the margin:[2] ?

12.14–23 **13.10–20** **8.37–9.3**
Text in KPM: "The manifestness of beings (ontic truth) revolves around the unveiledness of the Being-structure [*Seinsverfassung*, Taft: constitution of Being] of beings (ontological truth)."
In the margin: What does *Seinsverfassung* mean? Constitution? In any case, according to Heidegger, a structural component [*Verfassung*] of the Being of beings.

§3. The Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics as "Critique of Pure Reason"

13.5 **14.3** **9.13**
Text in KPM: "In this formula ['how are a priori synthetic judgments possible?'], following tradition, Kant understands knowing as judging."
Husserl underlines "tradition."
In the margin: Prejudice? [*Vorurteil?*]

---

[2] <For reasons of space, where Husserl does not underline a key word or make a comment, the text in *KPM* has not ordinarily been supplied here. The reader may seek out the context, sometimes a lengthy sentence, by locating in *KPM* the page and line that are given.>

13.9–11 **14.7–9** **9.17–19**
Text of KPM: This known what-being of the being is brought forward a priori in ontological knowledge prior to all ontic experience . . . ."
In the margin: ?

14.6 **15.3** **10.5**
Text in KPM: "It is ontological knowledge, i. e., the a priori synthesis."
Husserl underlines the whole sentence.
In the margin: Both are unclear.

14.20–22 **15.17–20** **10.17–19**
Text of KPM: "But the synthetic judgments, then, are 'synthetic' in a twofold sense: first, as judgments in general; and second, insofar as the legitimacy of the 'connection' (synthesis) of the representation is 'brought from' (synthesis from the being itself with which the judgment is concerned."
In the margin: ?

14.29–31 **15.27–30** **10.25–28**
In the margin: ?

15.15–17 **16.13–15** **10.29–11.2**
In the margin: ?

16.3–4 **17.2–3** **11.14–15**
Text in KPM: "The *Critique of Pure Reason* has nothing to do with a 'theory of knowledge'."
Husserl underlines the whole sentence.
In the margin: nothing?

16.6–8 **17.5–7** **11.16–18**
Text of KPM: "If one generally could allow the interpretation of the *Critique of Pure Reason* as a theory of knowledge, then that would be to say that it is not a theory of ontic knowledge (experience but rather a theory of ontological knowledge).
In the margin: Of course.

16.6–8 **17.10–15** **11.16–18**
In the margin: ?
?

16.28 **17.28** **11.34**
Text in KPM: "With this 'Copernican' revolution Kant forces the problem of ontology to center stage."
In the margin: What Heidegger calls ontology.

16.29–31 **17.28–32** **11.34–37**
Text of KPM: "Nothing can be presupposed on behalf of the problematic of the possibility for original, ontological truth, least of all the factum of the truth of the positive sciences."
In the margin: ?

Part Two
Carrying Out the Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics

A. THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THE DIMENSION OF GOING-BACK [NEEDED] FOR CARRYING OUT THE LAYING OF THE GROUND FOR METAPHYSICS

I. THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIELD OF ORIGIN

§4. The Essence of Knowledge in General

19.13–15 **21.7–8** **14.26–27**
Text of KPM: "It is precisely the humanness of reason, *i.e.*, its finitude, which will be essential for the core of this ground-laying problematic."
Husserl underlines "Humanness" and "finitude."
In the margin: NB <Notabene>

21.27 **24.6** **16.24**
Text of KPM: "The essence of finite human knowledge is illustrated by the contrast between it and the idea of infinite divine knowledge, or *intuitus originarius* ."
In the margin: NB <Notabene>

§5. The Essence of the Finitude of Knowledge

23.11–12 25.25–26 17.23–25
Text in KPM: "not every intuition as such is intaking [*hinnehmend*], only the finite."[3]
In the margin: Yes, categorial, etc.

24.10–11 27.3–4 18.19–20
Text in KPM: "The organs that serve affection are thus sense organs because they belong to finite intuition, *i.e.*, sensibility. With this, Kant for the first time attains a concept of sensibility which is ontological rather than sensualistic."
Husserl underlines from "a concept" to end of sentence.
In the margin: ? Not related to sense organs.

24.11–12 27.5 18.20
Text in KPM [the next sentence in the text]: "It follows, then, that if empirically affective intuition of beings does not need to coincide with 'sensibility,' the possibility of a nonempirical sensibility remains essentially open."
In the margin next to "It follows": Does it follow? [*Demzufolge?*]

24.16 27.10 18.23–24
Text of KPM: "Knowledge is primarily intuition, *i.e.*, a representing that immediately represents the being itself."
Husserl underlines "immediately represents" and "itself."
After "itself" Husserl inserts: (1)
In the margin: (1) Is this Kant?

24.16 27.10 18.24
In the margin next to the above: The thing in itself? [*Das Ding an sich?*]

24.19–21 27.13 18.26–27
Text of KPM: "Finite intuiting creatures [*Wesen*, plural] must be able to share in [*teilen*] the specific intuition of beings."
In the margin: Is this Kantian?

---

[3] <Where Heidegger's German in the first edition used wide spacing for emphasis, this has been retained in the translation, although in the fifth edition much of this wide spacing is deleted.>

24.25–28 **27.21–23** **18.31–33**

Text of KPM: So, for example, this intuited particular – this piece of chalk – must allow itself to be determined as chalk, or rather as a body. In this way, we are able jointly to know this being as the same for all of us.

In the margin: ?

26 **29.28–30.4** **20.2–6**

Text of KPM: "Understanding is all the more finite because it lacks the immediacy of finite intuiting."

In the bottom margin: Better: God needs no explication of intuition, no step-by-step getting to know things and to bring them back to himself [in recollection], no apperceptive transference, no fixation in language, etc. – but such a God is an absurdity.

27 **30.5** **20.7**

Text of KPM: Same as above.

In the top margin: What is infinity over against finitude? Why talk at all of finitude rather than receptivity, the grasping of the thing-as-it-gives-itself in anticipation, a relative self-giving, depending on the ever new? On the other hand: absolutely adequate intuition, etc., which, however, is an absurdity.

27.5 **30.9** **20.10**

Text of KPM: ". . . so too the finitude of understanding also indicates something more of the essence of absolute knowledge, namely an 'originating intuition.' "

Husserl underlines the word "absolute:"

In the margin: Finitude is not absolute.

27.5 **30.9** **20.10**

Text of KPM: Same as above.

Husserl inserts after "knowledge": 1)

In the margin: 1) nonsense [*Unsinn*].

27.31–32 **31.3–5** **20.34–35**

Text in KPM: "If finite knowledge is an intaking [*hinnehmende*, "taking in stride"] intuition, then what is knowable must show itself from itself.

Husserl underlines "hinnehmende."

In the bottom margin: All knowledge is intaking, thus not "unfortunately" intaking. The "thrownness" of the ego is not its finitude, its non-absoluteness. The Absolute is the world-constituting and itself immanently self-constituting, etc.

28.7–14 **31.12–20** **20.42–21.4**
Text of KPM: "Absolute knowing discloses the being in its letting-stand-forth and possesses it in every case 'only' as that which stands forth in the letting-stand-forth . . ."
In the margin: ? An absurdity [*ein Widersinn*].

28.19–24 **31.25–30** **21.8–12**
Text in KPM: "The being 'in the appearance' is the same being as the being in itself and this alone. . . .
In the margin: ?

29.7–9 **32.14–15** **21.24–26**
Text of KPM: "The being [or thing] can itself be manifest without being known 'in itself' (that is, as something standing-forth)."
In the margin: ? s.p.p. [see previous page; *i. e.*, the two preceding remarks].

30.6–8 **33.16–18** **22.11–12**
In the margin: ? !

30.11 **33.20** **23.4–6**
Text of KPM: "These concepts <of appearance and thing-in-itself>, however, do not refer to two classifications of objects arranged one behind the other within 'the' completely indifferent, fixed <field of> knowledge."
In the margin: The only thing that is demonstrable and plays a role here is the difference between the direct and straightforward attitude toward the object and the phenomenological attitude toward the constitutive "emergence."

31.13–15 **35.4–6** **23.4–6**
Text of KPM: Same as above.
Also in the margin: But this matter [*Sache*] is and remains absurd.

§6. The Ground for the Source of the Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics

34.7–8 37.29–30 25.2–3
Text of KPM: "It is a philosophizing laying of the ground for philosophy.
In the margin: ?

II. THE MANNER OF UNVEILING THE ORIGIN

§7. The Outline of the Stages in the Laying of the Ground for Ontology

34.18–35.2 38.13–25 25.14–23
Text of KPM: "If finite knowledge of beings is to be possible, then it must be grounded in a knowing of the Being of beings prior to all intake.
In the margin: ?

B. THE STAGES OF CARRYING OUT THE PROJECTION OF THE INNER POSSIBILITY OF ONTOLOGY

38,bottom margin 42.20–21 28.19–20
Text of KPM: "What is being inquired about is the essential possibility of ontological synthesis."
Husserl underlines "ontological synthesis."
In the bottom margin: Ontological synthesis – the constituting of the invariant structural form of the pre-given world. One need not begin with a traditional ontology; rather, one can pose the question as Hume did before Kant.
Husserl also adds next to this remark: One does not need the problem of finitude, either – Hume did not consider this at all.

39.1–2 42.21–22 28.20–21
Text in KPM: [Reference to what sentence is unclear.]
In the margin: ?

39, top margin 42.21–25 28.20–23
Text of KPM: "What is at issue is the essential possibility of ontological synthesis. When unfolded the question reads: How can finite human Dasein pass beyond

(transcend) beings and things [*das Seiende*] in advance when it has not only not created these things and beings but must be directed toward them in order to exist as Dasein?"

Husserl underlines "in order to exist as Dasein?"

In the top margin: But is this the right way to pose the question philosophically ? Isn't here an entity already presupposed whereby the presupposed Being [*Sein*] already presupposes subjectivity? Is not man himself already pre-given, etc.?

39.3–4 **42.24–25** **28.23**

Text of KPM: "in order to exist as Dasein?"

In the margin next to this phrase: This is already Heidegger.

---

pp. 40–114: No further marginal markings or remarks until near the end of the last section of Part 2 (§25):

---

§25. Transcendence as the Laying of the Ground for *Metaphysica Generalis*

115.18–20 **121.32–122.2** **83.13–16**

In the margin: ?

116.6–11 **122.22–28** **83–31–35**

Text of KPM: "This X <that Kant calls "the nonempirical object = X"> is a "something" of which we cannot know anything at all. . . . It is not knowable because it simply cannot become a possible object of knowing, *i.e.*, the possession of knowledge about a being-or-thing [*Seiendem*]. This it can never become because it is a Nothing [*ein Nichts*]."

In the margin: But the horizon is disclosable; constitution and transcendental subjectivity are knowable.

116.14 **122.31** **83.37**

Text of KPM: "Nothing means not a being, but nevertheless 'something'; it serves only as c o r r e l a t u m , *i.e.*, according to its essence it is pure horizon."

Husserl underlines "pure horizon."

In the margin: ???!!!

116.14–23 **122.31–123.8** **83.37–84.9**
Text in KPM is seemingly the whole paragraph .
In the margin: ?

118.1–5 **124.16–20** **85.1–4**
Text of KPM: "Kant wants to replace 'the proud name of an ontology' with that of a 'Transcendental Philosophy,' *i.e.*, with an essential unveiling of transcendence."
In the margin: So do I. [*So auch ich.*]

pp. 119–159 *---No further remarks until the middle of §31:*

Part Three
The Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics in Its Originality
[§28–§31]

B. THE TRANSCENDENTAL POWER OF IMAGINATION AS ROOT OF BOTH STEMS

§31. The Originality of the Previously Laid Ground and Kant's Shrinking-Back from the Transcendental Power of Imagination.

160.8 **168.22** **115.19**
Text in KPM: "To the extent that the essence of the subjectivity of the subject lies in its personality, which, however is synonymous with moral reason . . . ".
Husserl underlines "personality" [Personalität].
In the margin: in the Kantian sense.

§34. Time as Pure Self-Affection and the Temporal Character of the Self

180.16–17 189.4–5 129.14–15

Text of KPM: "The expression [referring to the 'concept of the representation of objects'] means the 'universal' which characterizes every representing of objects as such, *i.e.*, the letting-stand-against of . . . . This, says the thesis, will necessarily be affected through time."

Husserl underlines "Letting-stand-against."

In the margin: ?

180.26–28 189.13–15 129.22–24

Text of KPM: "Time is the only pure intuition to the extent that it prepares the look of succession out of itself, and it c l u t c h e s this as such t o i t s e l f as the formative in-taking."

In the margin: As immanent, time temporalizing is the time-in-the-world. [*Zeit zeitigend ist die Weltzeit*].

181.1 189.18 129.27

Text of KPM: "Time is in its essence [or by its very nature] pure affection [*Affektion*] of itself."

Husserl underlines "pure affection of itself."

In the margin: ?

181.1.4 189.18–22 129.27–29

Text of KPM: Same as above [181.1] and also the remainder of the paragraph.

In the margin: Self-constitution of immanent time, thus temporalization on a deeper level.

181.5–10 189.23–28 129.30–34

Text of KPM: "As pure self-affection, time is not an active affection that strikes a self which is at hand . . . . time as pure self-affection forms the essential structure of subjectivity."

In the margin: ?

181.14–23 189.33–190.6 130.2–8

In the margin next to the remaining lines of this paragraph: ??

181.30–31 190.14–15 130.14–15

Text of KPM: "Pure taking-in [*Hinnehmen*: taking-in-stride], however, means: becoming affected in the absence of experience, *i.e.*, self-affecting."

Husserl underlines the whole sentence.

In the margin: ??

182.1–4 190.16–19 130.16–18

Text of KPM: "Time, as pure self-affection, is that finite, pure intuition which the pure concept (the understanding), standing in essential service to intuition, carries along and as such enables." [Whole sentence wide-spaced in 1st edition.]

In the margin: This is certainly not an especially deep insight.

182.5 190.20 130.19

Text of KPM: "The idea of pure self-affection, as has now become clear, determines the inmost essence of transcendence [*Transzendenz*]. "

Husserl underlines the word "clear."

In the margin: ?

182.15 190.31 130.27–28

Text of KPM: " 'Now that which, as representation, can be antecedent to every act of thinking anything, is intuition. . . . ' "

In the margin: Kant

182.19–22 191.3–6 130.30–33

Text of KPM: "the way the mind, through its own activity (namely, this positing of its representation), consequently comes to be affected through itself, *i.e.*, according to an inner sense of its form."

Husserl underlines all of the above.

In the margin: This is obviously backwards [*verkehrt*].

182.23–25 191.7–9 130.34–35

In the margin: ?

183.1–6 191.14–18 131.2–6

Text of KPM: "It is absolutely not the case that a mind exists among others which, for it, are also something related to it, and that it practices self-positing. Rather this 'from-out-of-itself-toward . . . and back-to-itself' first constitutes the mental character of the mind as a finite self."

In the margin: This is a misleading formalization.

183.17–18 191.29–30 131.14–15

Text of KPM: "Time and the 'I think' no longer stand incompatibly and incomparably at odds with each other; they are the same."

Husserl underlines "Time and the 'I think' " and "they are the same."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

183.24–26 192.7–9 131.22–23

In the margin: ?

184.7–10 192.23–25 131.34–36

Text of KPM: "But does it follow from this that the ego is not temporal? Or does it come about that the ego is indeed so 'temporal' that it is time itself, and that, in accordance with its inmost essence, only as time itself does it become possible according to its ownmost essence?

In the margin: Is the ego the immanent time in which objective time temporalizes itself? [*sich zeitigt*]?

184.13–15 192.28–30 131.38–132.3

Text of KPM: "What does this mean then [when Kant says]: the 'fixed and perduring' ego comprises the 'correlate' ['*Korrelatum*'] of all our representations? First of all, this: the fixed and perduring ego carries out the letting-stand-against of something which is not only a r e l a t i o n to the going-out-to . . . [*Hin-zu-auf*] but also a c o r r e l a t i o n [*k o r r e l a t i o n*] of the coming-back-into . . . [*Zurück-zu-in*] and thus it forms the "that-which-is-there-over-against-us"][*das Dawider*; the Being-in-opposition].[4]

Husserl underlines "Letting-stand-against," "going out to . . .," and "coming-back-into."

In the margin: !!?? Are these fruitful descriptions?

184.21–22 193.5 132.7

Text of KPM: "Is Kant, who worked out the paralogism of substantiality based on his own laying of the

[4] <Heidegger here coins a special term. Without capitalization *dawider* does exist as an archaic form of *dagegen* [against this], but *das Dawider* here appears as a noun.>

groundwork for ontology,[5] supposed to have meant by the 'fixed and perduring' ego something like mental substance?"

Husserl underlines "paralogism of substantiality."

In the margin: But he himself says it is similar to a substance in the *Fortschritte* [*Advances*].[6] Isn't "substrate" something that is phenomenologically demonstrable (instead of metaphysically substructed)?

184.27–30 193.12–14 132.12–14

In the margin: ?

185.4–6 193.18–20 132.17–18

Text of KPM: "Insofar as the ego as such brings before itself in advance something like fixedness and perduring in general, does it form the horizon of selfhood."

Husserl underlines from '"brings" to end of sentence.

In the margin: ???!!!

185–13–16 193.28–30 132.25–26

In the margin: ?

185.17–18 193.31 132.27–28

Text of KPM: "Not only is nothing decided [by Kant] about the time-lessness and eternity of the ego, since then it has n o t b e e n i n q u i r e d i n t o a t a l l."

In the margin: Of course.

185.20–21 194.1–2 32.30

Text of KPM: "The ego, however, is 'fixed and perduring' in this transcendental sense as long as it is temporal, *i.e.*, as finite self."

Husserl underlines "as long as it is temporal, i.e., as finite self."

In the margin: As long as it is an ego, and can the ego be other than what it is according to its essence [*wesensmäßig*]?

185.24–25 194.5–6 32.32–34

Text of KPM: "If time as pure self-affection first c a u s e s the pure succession of the sequence of nows to s p r i n g f o r t h, then that which s p r i n g s f o r t h from it, and which is the only thing that is normally looked at in the 'measurement of time',

---

[5] Heidegger's footnote: A 348FF., B 406ff. <referring to Kant's *Preisschrift über die Fortschritte der Metaphysik seit Leibniz und Wolff* (1804).> See *Kants Werke*, ed. E. Cassirer. Vol. 8 (Berlin: B. Cassirer, 1922), pp. 249ff.>

[6] <See *Kants Werke*, ed. E. Cassirer. Vol 8 (Berlin: B. Cassirer, 1922), pp. 249ff.>

can n o t be sufficient in terms of its essence for determining the f u l l e s s e n c e of time."

Husserl underlines "time as pure self-affection" and "the pure succession of the sequence of nows," underlining "the sequence of nows" several times.

In the margin: Immanent time also has its sequences of nows.

185.30–31 194.12–13 132.38

Text of KPM [the very next sentence]: "Accordingly, if the "temporality" or timelessness of the ego is to be decided, then we must be guided by t h e o r i g i n a l e s s e n c e o f t i m e as pure self-affection."

Husserl underlines "original essence of time."

In the margin: What does "original essence" ["*ursprüngliches Wesen*"] mean?

186.7–9 195.1–3 133.5–6

Text of KPM: "Thus Kant argues [with reference to the principle of contradiction] that if the 'at the same time,' and therewith 'time,' were to stand within the principle, then it would be restricted to experientially accessible e n t i t i e s 'within time.' But this basic principle regulates all thought of anything at all. Thus the determination of time has no place in it."

Husserl underlines "experientially," "Within time," and "anything at all."

In the margin: But on Kantian anthropological grounds isn't anything whatever within time? Yes, an immanent temporal horizon is necessary.

187.3 195.14–15 133.16

Text of KPM: "With his orientation toward the nonoriginal essence of time in the 'principle of contradiction' Kant has to deny its temporal character; for it is contradictory to want to determine the essence of what time itself is originally with the help of a p r o d u c t derived from it."

Husserl underlines "time itself is originally."

In the top margin: The origin of time is not original time.

187.3–4 195.18 133.18

Text of KPM: "Precisely b e c a u s e the self in its innermost essence is t i m e i t s e l f, the ego cannot be conceived as something 'temporal,' that is to say here, within time."

Husserl underlines "the ego," the "not" in "cannot," and "as something temporal."

In the margin: The immanent life of the ego as, rather, originally temporalizing.

§35. The Originality of the Previously Laid Ground and the Problem of Metaphysics.

188.13 **196.32** **134.27**

Text in KPM: "Original time makes possible the transcendental power of imagination, which in itself is essentially spontaneous receptivity and receptive spontaneity."

Husserl underlines "makes possible."

In the margin: What does this "makes possible" [or "enables"] mean?

189.30 **198.14** **135.29–30**

Text in KPM: "Does this mean [for Kant] that the being or thing [*das Seiende*] is dissolved in a play of representation? Not at all. Kant wants to say that the encounter with a being or thing only occurs for a finite nature [*Wesen*, being] in a representing whose pure representations of objectivity as such interplay with it."

In the side margin: NB <Notabene>

In the bottom margin: In this unclarity Heidegger joins Kant.

190.1 **198.16–17** **135.30–31**

In the margin: Yes.

193.29–31 **202.11–12** **138.10–11**

Text in KPM: "Certainly in order to wring from what the words say what they w a n t to say, every interpretation necessarily has to use v i o l e n c e."

Husserl underlines "every interpretation necessarily has to use violence."

In the margin: !!!??? I differentiate between what they [the words] have wanted to say and what they [*i.e.*, the authors] ultimately aimed at and wanted to say as they said them.

Part Four
The Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics in a Retrieval[7]

A. THE LAYING OF THE GROUND FOR METAPHYSICS IN ANTHROPOLOGY

§36. The Previously Laid Ground and the Outcome of the Kantian Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics

196.19–21 205.27–28 140.23–24

Text in KPM: "W h a t t a k e s p l a c e in the Kantian ground-laying? Nothing less than the grounding of the inner possibility of ontology as an unveiling of transcendence, *i.e.*, of the subjectivity of the human subject."

Husserl underlines "unveiling" and "subjectivity of the human subject."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

§37. The Idea of a Philosophical Anthropology

199.10–17 208.23–30 142.21–27

Text in KPM: "And insofar as a human exists not only as natural being but a c t s [*h a n d e l t*] and creates, anthropology must also seek to grasp what humans as acting beings [*handelnde*] can and should 'make of themselves.' What it can and ought to do finally rests on basic positions the human as such can take up, which we call 'worldviews', whose psychology encompasses the whole of human knowledge [*Menschenkunde*]."

In the margin: This is indeed a bit hasty, and very unclear.

Text in KPM: ". . . it becomes mired in complete indeterminacy."

Husserl underlines "in complete indeterminacy."

In the margin: ?

[7] <The opening sentence of the section (139.3–4) defines retrieval: "By the retrieval of a basic problem, we understand the opening-up of its original, long-concealed possibilities, through the working out of which it is transformed.">

199.31–200.1 209.12–14 143.3–5

Text of KPM: "If everything in the world refers back to man in some way, the term Anthropology describes a fundamental tendency of man's contemporary position with respect to himself and to the totality of beings."

Husserl underlines from "describes" to the end of the sentence.

In the margin: In other words it is the prejudgment of Scheler, Heidegger, Dilthey, and of the whole anthropological line of thought [*Richtung*].

200.1–5 209.14–19 143.5–8

In the margin: ?

200.1 209.14–15 143.5

Text of KPM: "According to this fundamental position, something is known and understood only if it is given an anthropological explanation.

Husserl inserts above the phrase "this fundamental position": modern <modifying "position">.

201.9 210.20–21 143.34–35

Text of KPM: "Perhaps instead a difficulty lies in the very concept itself."

Husserl underlines "a difficulty lies in the very concept itself."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

201.18–20 210.30–211.1 144.6–8

Text of KPM: "Certainly an anthropology can be called philosophical insofar as its method is a philosophical one, perhaps in the sense of its being an essential aspect of a human being."

Husserl underlines "method is a philosophical one" and "an essential aspect of human being."

In the margin: But investigation into essence [*Wesensbetrachtung*] does not yet make it philosophy <instead of anthropology>.

202.1–6 211.13–18 144.17–21

Text of KPM: See next below.

In the top margin: The goal of philosophy as the working out of a worldview.

202.5–6 211.16–18 144.19–20

Text of KPM: "If the goal of philosophy lies in the working out of a worldview, then an anthropology will have to

delimit the 'place [*Stellung*] of man in the cosmos.'"
Husserl underlines "the 'place of man in the cosmos' "
In the margin next to the first half of the sentence: 1). <Nothing, but see top margin above.>
In the margin next to the second half of the sentence: 2).
In the margin below 2): What does "*Stellung*" mean <here>?

202.6–9 **211.19–22** **144.21–23**
In the margin: NB <Notabene>

202.9–10 **211.22** **144.24**
Text of KPM: "And if the human being is taken as that being [*Seiende*] which, in the order of grounding an absolutely certain knowledge, is plainly the first-given and most certain, then its plan for developing philosophy must make human subjectivity central to its approach."
Husserl underlines "human subjectivity."
In the margin: So Heidegger himself uses the taboo word here.

202.16 **211.29** **144.29**
Text of KPM: "But it is on the basis of precisely these various possibilities for delimiting the philosophical character of an anthropology that the indeterminateness of this idea arises."
Husserl underlines "indeterminateness."
In the margin: Why indeterminateness?

202.24–25 **212.2–3** **144.35**
Text of KPM: "Thus, although the idea of a philosophical anthropology may be natural and self-evident in spite of its ambiguity, and although it every now and again comes to be accepted as irresistably valid, in philosophy one again and again struggles against 'anthropologism.' "
Husserl underlines "struggles against 'anthropologism.' "
In the margin: Why?

203.4–6 **212.17–20** **145.3–5**
Text of KPM: "But even if anthropology in a certain sense gathers into itself all the central problems of philosophy, why do these allow us to follow them back to the question of what man is?"
Husserl underlines all but the first four words of the sentence.
In the margin: It is just this that is not correct.

203.10–18 212.23–32 145.7–14
In the margin: ?

203.30 213.9 145.24
Text of KPM: "Human beings do not belong at the center of beings and things."
In the margin: What does "at the center" mean?

203 213.7–13 145.22–26
Text of KPM: Presumably the same as above.
In the bottom margin: The opponents of anthropology as a foundational discipline in philosophy – who reject an anthropologically based philosophy as "anthropologism" – will not be so foolish as to deny the central place of reflective man in a world that is oriented to him.

203.31–33 213.11–13 145.25–26
In the margin: ?

204.3–5 213.16–18 145.28–30
Text of KPM: "So critical reflection on the idea of a philosophical anthropology shows us not only its indeterminate character and limitations but makes clear, above all, that we lack a basis and framework for a fundamental questioning as to its essential nature."
In the margin: ? But [such is lacking] also for fundamental questioning with regard to all positive science.

§38. The Question Concerning the Human Essence and the Authentic Result of the Kantian Ground-Laying

205.12–13 214.26–27 146.18–19
Text of KPM: "This [falling back into the subjectivity of the subject] makes manifest, rather, that Kant, through his laying of the foundation, himself undermines the floor that he puts forward at the beginning of the <First> Critique."
Husserl underlines "Kant, through his laying of the foundation, himself undermines the floor."
In the margin: NB <Notabene> But Heidegger <does this> also.

206.30–32 216.9 147.23

Text of KPM: "An all-powerful entity [*Wesen*] need not ask: What can I do?"

Husserl underlines "an all-powerful entity need not ask: What can I do?

In the margin: Is then such a being essentially possible at all? [*Ist denn ein solches Wesen wesensmöglich?*]

207 top 216.12–16 147.25–29

Text of KPM: "This not-being-able [*Nichtkönnen*, incapacity], however, is not a lack but rather what cannot be touched in every lack and every 'not.' Whoever asks 'What can I do?' announces therewith a f i n i t u d e . "

In the top margin above: Finitude.

209.13–15 218.17–20 149.7–9

Text of KPM: "All the same, the fact that 'philosophical anthropology' does represent a task of its own type, and how it does this – quite aside from the problems involved in a grounding of metaphysics – cannot be discussed here."

In the margin: What does Heidegger have in mind?

B. THE PROBLEM OF FINITUDE IN HUMAN BEINGS AND THE METAPHYSICS OF DASEIN

209.18–21 218.23–27 149.12–15

Text of KPM: "In order to bring to light this fundamental problem, the problem of the necessity of the question of the finitude in human beings, intending to lay the groundwork for a metaphysics, I undertook the present interpretation of the *Critique of Pure Reason*."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

§39. The Problem of a Possible Determination of Finitude in Human Beings

210.10 219.17 149.29

Text of KPM: "Thus it may already suffice in order to name human beings as finite, to bring in at random any of their imperfections."

Husserl underlines "imperfections."
In the margin: How does imperfection enter in here? [*Wie kommt da Unvollkommenheit herein?*]

§40. The Original Working-Out of the Question of Being as the Way to the Problem of Finitude in Human Beings

212.30–213.2 222.10–11 151.31–32
Text of KPM: "The basic question of the old φυσιολογοι [*physiologoi*, nature-oriented philosophers] about being as such [*Seiendem überhaupt*] (about the λογος [logos] of the φυσις [physis]) has been developed – and this is the inner development of ancient metaphysics from its beginnings to Aristotle – from the indeterminacy and fullness of its original universality to the determinacy of both lines of questioning [*logos* and *physis*], which, according to Aristotle, together comprise authentic philosophizing."
Husserl underlines "both lines of questioning, which, according to Aristotle, together comprise authentic philosophizing."
In the margin: NB <Notabene>

213.9–13 222.18–23 152.2–6
Text of KPM: "In the question of what a being or thing [*das Seiende*] as such is, a thing is pursued in terms of what determines the being or thing as being or thing. We call this the Being of the being or thing [*Sein des Seienden*], and the question about it the Being-question [*Seinsfrage*, question of Being].
In the margin: NB <Notabene>

213.23–24 223.4–5 152.15–16
Text of KPM: "In order for us to grasp the essential determinacy of beings by Being, the determining must itself be comprehended. . . ."
Husserl underlines "of beings by Being."
In the margin: ?

213.32–214.1 223.14–16 152.24–26
Text of KPM: "In order to verify that such a concrete problematic does present itself, a reference will suffice to something in ancient philosophy which has been

accepted as all too self-evident."
Husserl underlines "in ancient philosophy which has been accepted as all too self-evident."
In the margin next to the first line: ? But this is the constant theme in constitutive phenomenology.

214.4–5 **223.19–20** **152.29**
Text of KPM: "It [its what-being, which philosophy calls its essence] makes a being possible as what it is."
Husserl underlines the whole sentence.
Husserl continues his remark in the top margin: For that reason [*Daher*], <continuing now in top margin> if for Heidegger things and beings in the world [*das Seiende*] are taken as pregiven in themselves, then he would have to say: It [*Wesen*, the essence] makes the things and beings accessible to us.

214.6–8 **223.22–24** **152.31–33**
Text of KPM: "To the question of what a being is, the appearance (*eidos*), gives the same information in response. For this reason the what-being of the being or thing <in Greek> is called '*idea*.' "
In the margin: ?!

214.23–25 **224.5–7** **153.4–6**
Text of KPM: "Without a working out of this question [what is Being as such], are we not lacking any horizon whatever for the attempt to 'define' the essentiality of the essence and to 'explain' the actuality of the actual?"
In the margin: I don't see this at all.

214.29–31 **224.11–13** **153.7–9**
In the margin: ?

214 bottom **224.16–225.4** **153.16–30**
Text of KPM: "from whence are the likes of Being, and indeed with it the whole wealth of articulations and relationships contained in it to be grasped at all?"
In the bottom margin: I can interrogate every being or thing according to its "characteristics," its "relations"; I can interrogate each in terms of its "common, general essence" ["*allgemeinen Wesen*"], and I can then contrast the entity with this general essence (the

eidos, or idea, not its external appearance) and say that this is something belonging to it in the manner of *methexis* (participation in the idea), as that which belongs to this entity just as it does with all possible entities that are its various forms. I can <conceive> each being or thing as an "individuality" of a real or possible multiplicity, etc. These are the formal categories. Are there [*Gibt es*] features, etc., categories, just as there are [*es gibt*] dogs and cats? "Or is there a problem here that finally has to be faced?" <quoting Heidegger, and continuing in bottom margin of 215> What problem? Straightforwardly and evidently [*Geradehin und evident*] I obtain the formal-ontological by judging about beings-and-things in general (and this is not restricted to "worldly entities" which are probably not the only or the only possible type of entity); and [I obtain] the worldly[8]-formal (material) <by judging> about worldly entities (material things). But I do not yet find this satisfactory. The subject-relation, that of consciousness, of knowing, brings with it difficulties that characterize modern philosophy. These difficulties do not have to do with a mythical Being, but rather with the essential relationship between entities [or beings and things] as such and subjectivity as such, for which it <referring to this relationship, or possibly, subjectivity> exists [*für die sie ist*]. Only in this way does one get to the real problems of constitution.

215.6–12 224.19–26 153.16–21

Text of KPM: "Must we not first ask: From whence in general do we lay hold of the point of view from which to determine Being as such and thus to win a concept of Being from which the possibility and the necessity of the essential articulation of Being becomes understandable?"

Husserl's answer: No. How do I determine about beings and things [entities] as such, and what varied concepts arise out of the manner of my determining – my evidential determining? What ways of self-giving, and in them what leaps forward as "self"? Thus <emerges> a subjective turn toward cognition and toward consciousness in general as performative, and again

[8] <The transcription of this word is not entirely sure.>

this leads to transcendental subjectivity in contrast to psychological subjectivity.

215.19–23 225.1–5 153.26–30

Text of KPM: "Now if there exists an inner connection between the grounding of metaphysics and interrogating the finitude in human beings, then the more originary working out of the Being-question that we have now achieved will contribute to it i n a m o r e e l e m e n t a r y w a y by showing its essential relationship to the problem of finitude.

In the margin: But this is an inappropriate way of putting it.

215.27 225.9 153.33–34

Text of KPM: "What may I hope?"

Husserl underlines the sentence.

In the margin: Backwards! [*Verkehrt!*]

215.29–30 225.11–13 153.35–37:

Text of KPM: "How is the question of Being, particularly in the first in which it has now been developed as the question concerning the possibility of comprehending Being to have any relation at all to the essential relationship to finitude in human beings?"

Husserl underlines "possibility" and "the essential relationship to finitude in human beings."

In the margin: <This is> a subjective possibility, but quite unclear when brought in in this way.

216.1–2 225.17–18 153.40–41

Text of KPM: "An essential relation <of the question of Being> to the finitude of human beings is not evident [*ersichtlich*, obvious]."

In the margin: Yes.

216.4 225.20–21 154.1

Text of KPM: "But if up to now we have clarified the original form of the problem of Being in the orientation derived from the Aristotelian question, this is not to say that the origin of this problem lies there."

Husserl underlines "clarified."

In the margin: ?

216.6–9 **225.24–26** **154.3–6**

Text of KPM: "Authentic philosophizing will only then be able to come upon the question of Being if this question belongs to the innermost essence of philosophy, which itself is only as a decisive possibility of human Dasein."

Husserl underlines the last half of the sentence, beginning with "belongs to the innermost essence of philosophy..."

In the margin: What a leap [*Welcher Sprung*]

216.13.15 **225.31–226.1** **154.10–11**

Text of KPM: "When I ask about the possibility of grasping something like Being . . . I am asking about the possibility of grasping t h a t w h i c h w e a l l a s h u m a n b e i n g s already and constantly understand."

In the margin: We already experience the world, we already make claims about the world, the worldly, and eventually with evidence; and as we do so, we experience ourselves as humans in the world and we "grasp" ["*Begreifen*," understand] ourselves as humans who inquire in this manner. But we get bogged down in difficulties through subjective reflection.

216.15–18 **226.1–2** **154.11–14**

Text of KPM: "The question of Being arises from the preconceptual understanding of Being, as a question concerning the possibility of the concept of Being."

Husserl underlines "possibility of the concept."

In the margin: 1) Not by pursuing the possibility of the concept of Being, but rather the possibility of doing away with the bewilderments in which the world as "world for us" has entangled us – and also every entity whatever as entity for us. Or the possibility of pursuing the meaning of the being or thing as such, and how this which is certain for us in naïve evidentness can be reconciled as certain as "in itself" over against the contingency of human knowing (of having it in consciousness as such), and therewith the thing or being can have the (formal and material) meaning it has for us, and no other than what it has for us, etc.

216.17–18 226.2–3 154.13–14

Text of KPM: "The Being-question as question about the possibility of the concept of Being arises from its side from our p r e c o n c e p t u a l u n d e r s t a n d i n g o f B e i n g."

Husserl adds a "2)" after "preconceptual understanding of Being."

In the margin: 2) We obtain all our concepts of entities in a primordial, self-giving way from the grasping activity [of our minds] on the basis of preconceptual experience; even the concepts we have of Being, also, of course, so far as it has a good meaning. What is at issue here, however, is not the possibility, essence, or concept of Being, but rather the psychological and, and because it is so difficult, the transcendental possibility of an entity as such also being an entity for us; that is to say, with the not yet conceptually grasped, <*continuing in the bottom margin of the next page*> the not yet systematically investigated constituting subjectivity, and also the essential unity of that which has arisen out of naïve, lived, but unthematized constitution, <*i.e.*> which is simply and exclusively for us existing beings [*Daseienden*] (beings and their concepts [*Seienden und seiner Begriffe*]) with transcendentally functioning subjectivity <;> and on the basis of this, <what further concerns us is the possibility> of a concrete, full grasp of the essence of the being or thing, a grasp which leaves open no question of essence for beings-as-such and for the entity with world; <all> this <is contained> in the necessary transition to the totality and its necessity.

216.20–23 226.6–8 154.16–18

Text of KPM: "The task of the laying of the ground for metaphysics, grasped in a more original way, is therefore transformed into the elucidation of the inner possibility for the understanding of Being."

Husserl underlines "transformed"

In the margin: <Yes,> it is transformed, it becomes a completely different one [task].

§41. The Understanding of Being and Dasein in Human Beings

217.1–2 **226.19–20** **154.27–28**

Text of KPM: "Beings are known to us – but Being? Are we not seized with vertigo . . . ?"

Husserl underlines both sentences – from "Beings" to "vertigo."

In the margin: No, being-constituted! [*Nein, das Konstituiert-Sein!*] The vertigo comes only from the unclarity of the concept of Being.

217.8–9 **226.28** **154.32–34**

Text of KPM: "With the question of Being as such, we venture to the brink of total darkness, and yet we should not too quickly side-step the question but rather get closer to the full particuliarity of the understanding of Being."

Husserl underlines "the understanding of Being."

In the margin: Not <the full particularity> of the understanding of "Being" but rather of understanding, of experiencing, of otherwise having awareness of beings and things [*von Seiendem*]. The obscurity of the meaning of the being or thing [*von Seiendem*] is <really> the unclarity about how the essence of the being or thing is to be held free of the incongruities [*Unstimmigkeiten*] which stem from subjective reflection.

217.23–24 **227.13** **155.11–12**

Text of KPM: "In every mode in which something is "this way or that" our Being-there becomes manifest to us.

Husserl underlines "manifest."

In the margin: Conscious [*bewußt*], yes, or thought of [*vermeint*] (which is a stopgap word, for lack of a better one), but precisely *not* "manifest"!

217.24–25 **227.13–14** **155.12–13**

Text of KPM: "We understand Being, and yet we lack the concept."

In the margin: We lack it? When would we need it?

217.25 **227.14** **155.13**

Text of KPM: "With every mood wherein 'something is this way or that,' our Being-there becomes manifest to us. We thus understand Being, and yet we lack the concept."

Husserl places a "1)" after the above sentence.

In the top margin (of p. 217): 1) [becomes] manifest [*offenbar*] – this word is suitable only in reference to self-giving and when an opinion is explicated with clarity, but not for the horizonal consciousness, for latent anticipation, and among these, "mood." Here we have intended being implicitly, not only preconceptually but also not yet clearly and distinctly intended, let alone being experienced, as yet not thematic – preconceptually thematic, etc.

218.1–2 **227.21–12 155.19–20**

Text of KPM: "Being as such comes into question so seldom that it appears as if [*aussieht*] there 'is' nothing of the sort."

In the margin: Does it 'appear as if' it is? [*Sieht es so aus?* Is this the way it looks?]

218.5–8 **227.25–28 155.22–25**

Text of KPM: "And yet, if understanding of Being did not occur, a human being would never be able to be as the being that it is, even were it fitted out with ever so wonderful capacities."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

218.5–6 **227.25–26 155.23**

Text of KPM: Same as above.

Husserl also places a sign [*] after the phrase "if understanding of Being did not occur."

In the top margin: *If the event [*Geschehen*] of understanding Being is an accidental <or contingent, *zufälliges* > one, it could also not be – in the world, could it stop? Could world be modified "merely" through the fact that in it there would be no understanding human, no being who understands? It is self-evident that no human could be except as an "understanding" being, just as it is self-evident that a thing [*ein Ding*] <is> *res extensa*. This is a moment belonging to the essence of its being, so it is nonsense to say "regardless of what wonderful faculties a human being might be equipped with" <quoting Heidegger>. Faculties are intentional faculties.

218.10 **227.31** **155.27**

Text of KPM [the next sentence after the one above]: "The human being is a being that is in the midst of beings and things [*von Seiendem*, of being], indeed in such a way that the being it is not and the being it itself is have at the same time always already become manifest."

Husserl underlines "always already become manifest."

In the margin: Is "manifest" ["*offenbar*"] a more pregnant expression than "conscious of" ["*bewußt*"]?

218.13–18 **228.1–6** **155.30–34**

Text of KPM: "In his behavior towards beings and things that a human being is not, the human being finds these already before it as that which supports it and on which it depends, yet of which it can never be master for all its technology and culture. Dependent on the beings and things [*das Seiende*] which it is not, it is at the same time basically not master even of the entity [*des Seienden*] it itself is."

In the margin: Can this be put forward already at the beginning, is this phenomenologically self-given?

218.19–20 **228.7–8** **155.35–36**

Text of KPM: "With the existence of the human being, an irruption takes place into the totality of beings and things in such a form that only now do beings and things in ever greater breadth and variety. . . become manifest as entities."

In the margin: Well, then: This takes place only as man comes into the world, etc., "now . . . first" – not with the animals or plants, or the mere natural things, etc.

219.5 **228.26** **156.7**

Text of KPM: "As a mode of Being, existence [*Existenz*] is in itself finitude."

Husserl underlines the whole sentence.

In the margin: Finitude = thrownness, etc.

219.8–19 **228.29–229.9** **156.9–19**

Text of KPM: "There is and must be something like Being where finitude has come to exist. Thus, understanding of Being manifests itself, unrecognized in its breadth, constancy, indeterminacy, and unquestionability, and rules the existence of the human being as the innermost foundations of its

finitude."

In the margin: But is this not really self-evident - man lives in the infinite world, [but] the reach of his consciousness, including his practice, is finite because infinity is nothing but satisfiability [*Erfüllbarkeit*], determinability in the And-So-On [*Und-so-weiter*].

219.20 229.10 156.20

Text of KPM: "On the basis of self-understanding the human being is the there [*das Da*], with whose Being [*Sein*] there takes place the manifesting break-in into being [*der eröffnende Einbruch in das Seiende*, a disclosive entrance into the realm of beings and things].

In the margin: *Da-Sein* [there-Being].

220.1–2 229.25–26 156.33

Text of KPM: "Now it is clear: we do not at all need to first inquire into a relationship of the understanding of being [*Seinsverständnis*] in human beings to finitude, for this understanding is itself the innermost essence of finitude."

In the margin: The understanding of Being <is> the innermost essence [*Wesen*] of finitude?

220.8–12 229.32–230.3 156.40–43

Text of KPM: "If man is only man on the basis of the Dasein in him, then the question about what is more primordial [*Ursprünglicher*] than human beings can basically not be an anthropological question."

In the margin: NB <Notabene> Earlier it was said to be on the basis of understanding of Being – so Dasein would seem to be identical with the understanding of Being.

220.13–14 230. 4–5 157.1–2

Text of KPM: "The problem of laying the foundations for metaphysics finds its root in the question of the Dasein in the human being...."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

220.13–16 230.4–8 157.1–3

Text of KPM: "The problem of laying the foundations of metaphysics is rooted in the question concerning the Dasein in man, *i.e.*, concerning his innermost

ground, concerning the understanding-of-Being as essentially existent finitude. The question about Dasein asks what the essence of the being determined in this way is.":

In the margin: NB <Notabene>,

In the margin above the first two lines of the sentence: So Dasein in human beings = understanding-of-Being!

220.13–14 230.14–15 157.10–11

Text of KPM: Same as above.

In the margin next to the first two lines of the sentences above: Essence of Being [*Wesen des Seins*], of *Dasein.*

221.4–5 230.28–30 157.22–23

Text of KPM: "This phrase <of Kant in a letter that refers to *KPR* as 'the metaphysics of metaphysics'> definitively strikes down every effort to search, even partially, for a "theory of knowledge" in the *Critique of Pure Reason.*"

Husserl underlines "theory of knowledge."

In the margin: ?!

C. THE METAPHYSICS OF DASEIN AS FUNDAMENTAL ONTOLOGY

221.12 231.5 157.30

Text of KPM: "No anthropology which still understands its own questioning and the pre-/<line break here> suppositions of that questioning can claim to develop even only the problem of laying the foundations for metaphysics, let alone carry it through."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

§42. The Idea of a Fundamental Ontology

223.21–25 233.16–20 159.15–18

Text of KPM: "The fundamental-ontological construction is distinguished by the fact that it is to lay open the inner possibility of something that rules all there-being as best-known, but which is at the same time indefinite and even all too self-evident."

Husserl underlines "inner possibility of something" and "best-known."

In the margin: namely, Being.

§43. The Inception and the Course of Fundamental Ontology

224.18–22 234.9–13 160.2–5

Text of KPM: "The *Dasein* in the human being determines it as that being which, existing in the midst of being and things, comports itself as a being, and as this comportment to beings and things, for it every other manifest being and thing, then, is determined essentially differently."

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

224.27 234.18 160.9

Text of KPM: "Now an analytic of Dasein must first of all take care to make visible in Dasein that mode of Being in human beings whose nature it is to repress the Dasein and its understanding of Being, that is, its primordial finitude," into forgottenness.

Husserl underlines the words "primordial finitude."

In the margin: ?

225.2–11 234. 21–235.3 160–11–19

Text of KPM: "The analytic of everydayness has, at the same time, the methodological aim from the beginning not to allow the interpretation of Dasein in the human being to enter into the realm of an anthropological-psychological description of its 'experiences' ['*Erlebnisse*'] and 'capabilities' ['*Vermögen*']. Anthropological-psychological knowledge is not thereby declared false. But we propose to show that this description, for all its correctness, does not suffice to hold in view from the beginning and continuously the problem of the existence of Dasein

– and its finitude – which is what the problematic of the Being-question demands."

In the margin: NB!! <Notabene!!>

227.1–7 236.29–35 161.34–39

Text of KPM: "From that <namely, that 'the working out of the nature of finitude itself must always be finite and never absolute'> only this follows: the ever renewed reflection on finitude cannot succeed through a reciprocal interplay and mediating of standpoints in order finally to attain an absolute knowledge of finitude that is accepted as "true in itself" although it had been hiddenly put forward although it had been hiddenly posited earlier. Rather, there remains only the working out of the problematic of finitude as such. . . ."

In the margin: <This is> not really understandable [*nicht recht verständlich*].

227.28–31 237.23–25 162.8–10

Text of KPM: "If, accordingly, one wishes to undertake a c r i t i q u e of the transcendental interpretation of "Care" as the transcendental unity of finitude, . . . then it will be necessary to show that the t r a n s c e n d e n c e of the Dasein, and therewith that the understanding of Being, is n o t the innermost finitude of man, . . . so that the basic problem of foundation-laying in metaphysics does not lie enclosed in the problem of the inner possibility of the understanding of Being."

In the margin: hic [here]

§45. The Idea of Fundamental Ontology and the *Critique of Pure Reason*

233.32 243.28–29 166.23–24

Text of KPM: "If the essence [or nature, *Wesen*] of transcendence is grounded in the imagination, or more originally in temporality, then the very idea of a 'transcendental logic' is a nonconcept [*ein Unbegriff*]."

Husserl underlines "the very idea of a 'transcendental logic' is a nonconcept."

In the margin: ?

235.1–3 245.1–4 167.15–18

Text of KPM: "Or is there not, within our own endeavors, if we may compare them [to Kant's] at all, also in the end a hidden sidestepping of something which we – and not accidentally – no longer see?"

In the margin: Yes.

236.13–14 246.13–14 168.18–19

Text of KPM [final page]: "Can the finitude in Dasein be developed only as a problem and without a 'presupposed' infinity?"

In the margin: NB <Notabene>

PART FOUR

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE

FOR EDMUND HUSSERL ON HIS SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY[1] April 8, 1929

by
Martin Heidegger

translated by Thomas Sheehan

For your students the celebration of this day is the source of a rare and pure joy. Indeed, we will be adequate to this occasion only if, from first to last, we let the gratitude that we owe you be the basic mood that suffuses everything.

In keeping with a beautiful custom, we offer you today, as our gift on this celebratory occasion, a slender volume of some short essays. This can hardly be an adequate return for all that you, our teacher, have lavished upon us, and awakened and nourished in us.

In the coming days many will attempt to survey your philosophical work and to evaluate its impact and effect on a number of different scales. In that way much will be brought to mind that should not be forgotten. And yet, such a way of parceling out a person's intellectual impact and calculating the influence of his writings fails to grasp the essential thing for which we now owe you thanks.

Nor is that essential element to be found by reflecting instead on the fruitfulness of your academic teaching career. Such fruitfulness will be every professor's prerogative and good fortune, as long as the German university escapes the fate of becoming a stultifying trade school.

No, the essence of your leadership consists in something else, namely, that the content and style of your questioning should immediately force one into intense critical dialogue and should demand at each moment a readiness to reverse or even abandon one's position.

---

[1] Martin Heidegger, "Edmund Husserl zum 70. Geburtstag," *Akademische Mitteilungen*: Organ für die gesamten Interressen der Studentenschaft von der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität in Freiburg/Br., 4. Folge, 9. Semester, Nr. 14, May 14, 1929, pp. 46–47.

Of course none of us is sure that it will be ours to find the path to what your work, quite unobtrusively, has constantly sought to guide us: that calm state of being mature and ready for the problems.[2]

And so too the works we present you are merely a witness to the fact that we *wanted* to follow your lead, not proof that we succeeded in becoming your disciples.[3]

But there is one thing we retain as a lasting possession: Each of us who was privileged to follow in your footsteps was confronted by you, our esteemed teacher, with the choice of either becoming the steward of essential things or working against them.

If, on the occasion of this celebration, we view your philosophical existence [*Dasein*] in this way, we also secure fixed points of reference for a true assessment of the value of your philosophical work.

Was it that several decades ago a new movement emerged and gained influence amidst the trends then dominant in philosophy? Or that a new method was added to the list of previous ones? Or that long-forgotten problem-areas got reworked?

Was it that the already available space for philosophical inquiry merely expanded and became more complex? Is it not, rather, that first and foremost your research created an entirely new space for philosophical questioning, a space with new claims, transformed assessments, and a fresh regard for the hidden powers of the great tradition of Western philosophy?

Yes, it was precisely that. The decisive element of your work has not been this or that answer to this or that question, but instead this breakthrough into a new dimension of philosophizing.

But this breakthrough is nothing less than the radicalizing [of how to do] philosophy, the bending of philosophy back onto the hidden path of its authentic historical happening as this announces itself in the inner communion of the great thinkers.

Philosophy, then, is not a doctrine, not some simplistic scheme for orienting oneself in the world, not at all an instrument or achievement of human Dasein. Rather, it is *this Dasein itself* insofar as it happens, in freedom, from out of its own ground.

Whoever, by dint of research, has arrived at this self-understanding of philosophy is granted the basic experience of all philosophizing, namely, that the more fully and originally [philosophical] research comes into its own,[4] the

---

[2] "*...in die Gelassenheit, reif zu werden für die Probleme.*"

[3] "*...nur eine Bezeugung dessen, daß wir Ihrer Führerschaft folgen wollten, nicht ein Beweis dafür, daß die Gefolgschaft gelungen.*"

[4] The words "comes into its own" translate "sich...ins Werk setzt," which in turn refer to ἐντελέχεια / ἐνέργεια, that is, the act of being gathered into τέλος / ἔργον. See Martin Heidegger, *Wegmarken*, GA I, 9, Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1976, edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, pp. 284-286, E.T., "On the Being

more surely it is "nothing but" the *transformation* of the same few simple questions.

But those who wish to transform must bear within themselves the power of a fidelity that knows how to preserve. And no one will feel this power grow within him or her without being caught up in wonder. And no one can be caught up in wonder without traveling to the outermost limits of the possible.

But no one will ever become the friend of the possible without remaining open to dialogue with the powers at work in the whole of [human] eksistence. But that is the comportment of the philosopher: to attend to what has already been sung, which itself becomes perceptible in every essential occurrence of world.[5]

And in such comportment the philosopher enters the core of what is really at stake in what is given to him or her to do.

Plato knew about that and spoke of it in his Seventh Letter:

> ῥητὸν γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἐστιν, ὡς ἄλλα μαθήματα, ἀλλ' ἐκ πολλῆς συνουσίας γιγνομένης περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐτὸ καὶ τοῦ συζῆν ἐξαίφνης, οἷον ἀπὸ πυρὸς πηδήσαντος ἐξαφθὲν φῶς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γενόμενον αὐτὸ ἑαυτὸ ἤδη τρέφει. (Seventh Letter, 341c)

> "In no way can it be stated, as can the other things that may be learned [in the sciences]; rather, from out of a full communal eksistential dwelling with the thing itself, suddenly – as when a spark leaping from the fire sheds light – it happens in the soul, so as then to grow there, alone with itself."

---

and Conception of Φύσις," *Man and World*, 9, 3 (August, 1976), 255–258; and his *Nietzsche*, Pfullingen: Neske, second edition, 1961, II, 404–405; E.T. by Joan Stambaugh, *The End of Philosophy*, New York: Harper and Row, 1973, pp. 5–6.

[5] *"das Hineinhören in den Vorgesang, der in allem wesentlichen Weltgeschehen vernehmbar wird."*

APPENDIX TWO

LETTER TO ALEXANDER PFÄNDER
January 6, 1931

by
Edmund Husserl

Translated by Burt C. Hopkins

Freiburg in Breisgau, Jan. 6, 1931
40 Loretto Street

Dear Colleague:

Your letter shook me so profoundly that I was unable to answer it as soon as I should have. I am continuously concerned with it in my thoughts. Judge for yourself whether I have not inflicted more pain on myself than on you, and whether I may not ethically regard this guilt towards you and blame towards myself as stemming from the best conscience, something I have had to accept, and still must accept, as my fate.

Clarifing the matter requires that I lay out a part of my life history. I had quickly realized that the project for Parts II and III of my *Ideas* was inadequate, and in an effort (beginning in the autumn of 1912) to improve them and to shape in a more concrete and differentiated fashion the horizon of the problems they disclosed, I got involved in new, quite far-ranging investigations. (These included the phenomenology of the person and personalities of a higher order, culture, the human environment in general; the transcendental phenomenology of "empathy" and the theory of transcendental intersubjectivity, the "transcendental aesthetic" as the phenomenology of the world purely as the world of experience, time and individuation, the phenomenology of association as the theory of the constitutive achievements of passivity, the phenomenology of the logos, the phenomenological problematic of "metaphysics," etc.) These investigations stretched on all through the work-filled Freiburg years, and the manuscripts grew to an almost unmanageable extent. As the manuscripts grew, so too did the ever greater apprehension about whether, in my old age, I would be able to bring to completion what had been

entrusted to me. This impassioned work led to repeated setbacks and repeated states of depression. In the end what I was left with was an all-pervasive basic mood of depression, a dangerous collapse of confidence in myself.

It was in this period that Heidegger began to mature – for a number of years he was constantly at my side as my close assistant. He behaved entirely as a student of my work and as a future collaborator, who, as regards all the essentials of method and problematic, would stand on the ground of my constitutive phenomenology. My ever-increasing impression of his extraordinary natural talent, of his absolute devotion to philosophy, of the powerful energy of this young man's thought finally led me to an excessive assessment of his future importance for scientific phenomenology in my sense of the term. Because I realized that no one among the phenomenologists of the Göttingen and Munich tradition followed me in earnest; and because I had an absolute inner certitude that the phenomenological reduction and the transcendental constitutive structuring of philosophy would mean a "Copernican" revolution for philosophy; and because I felt overwhelmed with the burden of responsibility for securing that, it is understandable how I placed the greatest hopes in Heidegger. Yes, that was the great, up-lifting hope: to open up to him – presumably my one true student – the unsuspected breadth of my investigations, and to prepare him for his own discoveries. Time and again we talked of working together, of his collaboration in completing my investigations. We talked of how *he* would take charge of my manuscripts when I passed away, publishing the ones that were fully developed, and in general of how he would carry on my philosophy as a framework for all future work.

When he went to Marburg, I regarded his enormous success as a teacher as if it were my own success. His visits during [the academic] vacations were joyful events, highly prized opportunities to speak my mind with him and to inform him of my developments. To be sure, in the course of these visits, just as during the Freiburg years, he was rather vague or silent regarding the development of his own ideas. I, as usual, held firmly to my extravagant idea of his genius; inwardly I was virtually convinced that the future of phenomenological philosophy would be entrusted to him and that he not only would become my heir but also would surpass me.

Certainly when *Being and Time* appeared in 1927 I was surprised by the newfangled language and style of thinking. Initially, I trusted his emphatic declaration: It was the continuation of my own research. I got the impression of an exceptional, albeit unclarified, intellectual energy, and I worked hard and honestly to penetrate and appreciate it. Faced with theories so inaccessible to my way of thinking, I did not want to admit to myself that he would surrender both the method of my phenomenological research and its scientific character in general. Somehow or other the fault had to lie with me; it would lie with Heidegger only insofar as he was too quick to jump into problems of a higher

level. He himself steadily denied that he would abandon my transcendental phenomenology, and he referred me to his future second volume. Given my low self-confidence at the time, I preferred to doubt myself, my capacity to follow and appreciate the unfamiliar themes of his thought, than to doubt him. That explains why I entrusted to him the editing of my 1905 lectures on time (something that I afterwards had occasion enough to regret); and why I submitted to him (!) for his criticisms my rough draft of an article for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and together with him (!) tried to reorganize it (which of course promptly miscarried). I might mention that I had been warned often enough: Heidegger's phenomenology is something totally different from mine; rather than furthering the development of my scientific works, his university lectures as well as his book are, on the contrary, open or veiled attacks on my works, directed at discrediting them on the most essential points. When I used to relate such things to Heidegger in a friendly way, he would just laugh and say: Nonsense!

Thus, when it came down to choosing my successor, obsessed as I was with the idea of assuring the future of the transcendental phenomenology I had founded, I saw *him* as the only one who was up to the task, and so I had to decide unconditionally in his favor. I appeased my inner misgivings with the thought that his call to Marburg may have taken him away too soon from my instruction and influence. When he would come back to my side [here in Freiburg] – especially when he would learn about the important clarifications I had strugged to achieve in the meantime – he would reach his full maturity and get beyond his raw brilliance period. He himself readily agreed: Our common life in Freiburg would be one of profound intellectual exchange and steady philosophical continuity. –

This blindness arose from a profound exigency – from a sense of overwhelming scientific responsibility – and God help me, it was blindness, caused basically by the fact that I felt so completely isolated, like an appointed leader (*Führer*) without followers, that is, without collaborators in the radical new spirit of transcendental phenomenology.

As regards you, dear colleague, what has never changed are my feelings of friendship, my high esteem for your professional seriousness, for the exemplary solidity of your work. But one thing has changed: I have lost the faith of earlier years that you recognized the revolutionary significance of the phenomenological reduction and of the transcendental-constitutive phenomenology that arises from it, and that you and your students would share in the immense problematic of its meaning. – As for the rest, you should not overlook the role your age (you were 58 in 1928) had to play in the question of filling a chair. In that regard, at best you might have made the list [only] in an honorary capacity, and the way things stood it would possibly have been in third place, and even that would have been *very* unlikely. But for your own

sake I could not let this happen. Your sponsor could not have been a member of the commission: In the commission, *it is true,* mention of you was made by me; but admittedly you were not considered more closely in further discussions. There was not much discussion among the faculty, since from the beginning the mood was only for Heidegger and Cassirer. Only Cassirer presented any occasion for questions (possibly N. Hartmann, too?), which I had to answer. –

However, I still have to tell you how things turned out later between Heidegger and me. After he took over the chair, our exchanges lasted about two months. Then, with complete amicability, it was over. He removed himself from every possibility of professional discussion, even in the simplest form. Clearly such discussion was an unnecessary, unwanted, uneasy matter for him.

I see him once every couple of months, even less frequently than my other colleagues.

The success of the Paris lectures, along with *Formal and Transcendental Logic,* which were wrung from me at the same time (both in the course of four months) have given me back – and this is a great turn-about – the confidence in my powers. In looking back over the situation of my works since 1913 I realized that all the major lines have been sketched out now, more than I ever would have ventured to hope. [This is] enough for the writing of a concluding work whose plan has burdened me for a decade. Immediately after the printing of my last book, in order to come to a clear-headed and definitive position on Heideggerian philosophy, I devoted two months to studying *Being and Time,* as well as his more recent writings. I arrived at the distressing conclusion that philosophically I have nothing to do with this Heideggerian profundity, with this brilliant unscientific genius; that Heidegger's criticism, both open and veiled, is based upon a gross misunderstanding; that he may be involved in the formation of a philosophical system of the kind which I have always considered it my life's work to make forever impossible. Everyone except me has realized this for a long time. I have not withheld my conclusion from Heidegger.

I pass no judgment on his personality – it has become incomprehensible to me. For almost a decade he was my closest friend; naturally this is all over: Inability to understand each other precludes friendship.[1] This reversal in professional esteem and personal relations was one of the most difficult ordeals of my life. Also in its consequences, among which belongs your changed relationship to me, owing to the insult I must have inflicted on you. Do you now understand why I failed to write as frequently as I would have wanted?

It has saddened me deeply to hear that you and your wife had to suffer so much because of illness. I reiterate my own and my wife's deeply felt best

[1] *"Unverständlichkeit schließt Freundschaft aus."*

wishes. Also for the completion of your work. My relation *to you* is clear. Nothing will change my feelings of friendship and my high esteem for you.

Your old friend,
E. Husserl

I urge you to please treat this letter with discretion. How I may stand *scientifically* to Heidegger I have plainly expressed at every opportunity. There is now gossip enough, and my personal disappointment with Heidegger, etc., is nobody else's business.

APPENDIX THREE

EDMUND HUSSERL

PHENOMENOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
June, 1931

Translated by Thomas Sheehan and Richard E. Palmer[1]

[164] As is well known, over the last decade some of the younger generation of German philosophers have been gravitating with ever increasing speed toward philosophical anthropology. Currently Wilhelm Dilthey's philosophy of life, a new form of anthropology, exercises a great deal of influence. But even the so-called "phenomenological movement" has got caught up in this new trend, which alleges that the true foundation of philosophy lies in human being alone, and more specifically in a doctrine of the essence of human being's concrete worldly Dasein. Some view this as a necessary reform of the original constitutive phenomenology, one that for the very first time would supposedly permit phenomenology to attain the level of authentic philosophy.

All of this constitutes a complete reversal of phenomenology's fundamental standpoint. Original phenomenology, which has matured into transcendental phenomenology, denies to any science of human being, whatever its form, a share in laying the foundations for philosophy, and opposes all related at-

---

[1] Edmund Husserl, "Phänomenologie und Anthropologie," from Edmund Husserl, *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1922–1937), Gesammelte Werke*, XXVII, ed. Thomas Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1989, pp. 164–181 (with text-critical notes at pp. 300–307); this edition supersedes the first German edition published in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 2 (1941), 1–14. A translation by Richard G. Schmitt of the first edition appeared in *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*, ed. Roderick M. Chisholm, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960, pp. 129–142, and was reprinted in Edmund Husserl, *Shorter Works*, ed. Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston, South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1981, pp. 315–323.

Husserl delivered the lecture in 1931 to meetings of the Kantgesellschaft in Frankfurt (June 1), Berlin (June 10), and Halle (June 16). The original manuscript is preserved in two drafts, both written in Husserl's Gabelsberg shorthand, in Group F of Husserl's papers; thus the catalogue signature of the two drafts is F II, 1 and 2 (in German, *Konvolut* F II, 1, 2). The second of the two drafts (F II, 2) is the one translated here. Eugen Fink's typed elaboration of the lecture is archived as M II, 1; that is, it is found with those lectures (*Vorträge*) of Husserl's that were typed out by his assistants before his death.

While each translator reviewed the work of the other, Thomas Sheehan is chiefly responsible for the first half of the present English text, up to "...the initial moment of the method, the phenomenological reduction" (p. 172.34 of the German edition; here, p. 493.10), and Richard E. Palmer is responsible for the second half (from p. 172.35 on, in the German edition).

tempts at foundation-laying as being anthropologism or psychologism. Nowadays, however, the exact opposite is supposed to hold. Phenomenological philosophy is supposedly now to be constructed entirely anew from out of human Dasein.

With this conflict there have returned, in modernized form, all the old oppositions that have kept *modern philosophy* as a whole in motion. From the beginning of modern times, the subjectivistic orientation that is peculiar to the age has had its effect in two opposite directions, the one anthropological (or psychological) [165] and the other transcendental. According to one side it goes without saying that the subjective grounding of philosophy, which is continuously felt to be a necessity, has to be carried out by psychology. On the other hand, however, there is the demand for a science of transcendental subjectivity, a completely new science on the basis of which all sciences, including psychology, are for the first time to receive their philosophical grounding.

Should we just accept it as inevitable that this conflict must be repeated throughout all future ages, changing only its historical garb? The answer is no. Surely the method that philosophy requires on principle for its own grounding must be prefigured in the very essence of philosophy, in the fundamental sense of its task. If it is essentially a subjective method, then the particular meaning of this subjective factor needs to be also determined *a priori.* In this way it must be possible to arrive at a fundamental decision between anthropologism and transcendentalism on a level that stands above all the forms that philosophy and anthropology/psychology have taken down through history.

But here everything depends on actually possessing the *insights* that this fundamental decision presupposes. The abiding lack of them is what has allowed the conflict to go on endlessly. Are we in a position today to utilize those insights? Has the fundamental essence of philosophy and of its method now achieved such a radical clarification and apodictic conceptual grasp that we can make use of *them* in order to reach a definitive decision?

I shall try to convince you that in fact we now are in such a position, precisely as a result of the development of constitutive phenomenology. Without going into the details of that development, I shall try to sketch out the transcendental philosophical *method* that has achieved its pure clarification in constitutive phenomenology, as well as the *transcendental philosophy* (at least as an idea) that, thanks to this method, has entered upon a systematic process of concretely executed work. Having gained that insight, we will be able to arrive at the principled and definitive resolution of the question that is our topic today: to what degree any philosophy, and hence a phenomenological philosophy, can find its methodological grounding in a "philosophical" anthropology.

Let us start by contrasting pre-Cartesian and post-Cartesian philosophy. The

former is dominated by the old *objectivistic* idea of [166] philosophy going back to antiquity, whereas the post-Cartesian philosophy is oriented to a new *subjective-transcendental* idea.

Within the modern struggle for a true philosophy (and also in the methodological disputes indicated above) we find a concerted effort at genuinely overcoming the old idea of philosophy and science in the name of the new idea. In the present case, genuinely overcoming the old means at the same time preserving it by clarifying its true sense in the form of a transcendental-relative idea.

As we know, science in our European sense is, generally speaking, a creation of the Greek spirit. Its original name is philosophy, and the range of its knowledge is the totality of whatever has being at all. It branches out into specific disciplines, the main trunks of which we call sciences. But we give the name *philosophical* only to those sciences that generally deal with questions about everything that is, and do so in similar ways. However, the old all-encompassing concept, whereby philosophy includes all the sciences in a concretion, remains forever indispensable.

Initially the teleological notion of philosophy (or of science) was obscurely conceived; but step-by-step over a long process of development it has taken definite shape and has been clarified and consolidated. Knowledge within the attitude of θαυμάζειν, that of pure theoretical "interest," issues in an initial sense of science that soon proves inadequate. Mere empirical knowledge – descriptive, classificatory, and inductive – is not yet science in the full sense. It provides only relative and merely situational truths. Philosophy, as genuine science, strives for absolute and definitive truths that surpass all forms of relativity. In genuine sciences entities themselves, as they are in themselves, get determined. What manifests itself in the immediately intuited world, the world of our prescientific experience, is *self-evidently* (despite its relativity) a world that is actually in being, even if its intrinsically true qualities transcend straightforward experience. Philosophy as genuine science attains those qualities (even if only on the level of approximation) by having recourse to the *eidos*, the pure *a priori* that is accessible to everyone in apodictic insight.

Further development tends towards the following idea. Philosophical knowledge of the given world requires first of all a universal *a priori* knowledge of the world – one might say: a universal ontology that is not just abstract and general but also concrete and regional. It allows us to grasp *the invariant essential form, the pure* [167] *ratio of the world,* including all of its regional spheres of being. To put the same thing another way: Prior to knowledge of the factical world there is universal knowledge of those essential possibilities without which no world whatever, and this includes the factical world as well, can be thought of as existing.

This *a priori* makes possible a rational method for knowing the factical

world by way of a rational science of facts. Blind *empeiria* [knowledge of particulars] becomes rationalized and achieves a share in pure *ratio*. Under its guidance there arises knowledge grounded in principles, a rationally *clarificatory* knowledge of facts.

For example, with regard to corporeal nature: pure mathematics, as the *a priori* whereby nature can be thought at all, makes possible genuine philosophical natural science and even mathematical natural science. Yet this is more than just an example, since pure mathematics and mathematical natural science have allowed us to see, in an admittedly narrow sphere, *exactly what it was* that the original objectivistic idea of philosophy/science was striving for.

Let us now distinguish two things that have come to need such distinguishing only as a belated consequence of the modern turn, namely, the formal and the material elements within this conception. *Formaliter* what we are dealing with here is a universal and (in the sense I have indicated) rational knowledge of *whatever is*, in its totality. From the start, however, and throughout the entire tradition, the formal concept of "whatever is" (the concept of *"something at all"*) has always had a binding material sense: it has always meant what-is as worldly, what-is as *real*, i.e., something that derives the meaning of its being from the world that is in being. Allegedly, then, philosophy is the science of the totality of real things. But, as we shall see in a moment, it is precisely this kind of science that begins to come unstuck in modern times.

Beginning with Descartes, the development of modern philosophy set itself off in sharp contrast to all previous development. A new motif came into play, one that did not attack the formal ideal of philosophy – that of rational science – but that nonetheless in the long run completely transformed philosophy's material sense, as well as the ideal itself. The *naïveté* with which one presupposes that the world is *self-evidently in being* – given to us by experience as self-evidently already out there – is lost: The self-evidentness turns into an *great enigma*. Descartes' regress from this pre-given world to the *subjectivity that experiences the world*, and thus to the subjectivity of consciousness itself, gives rise to [168] an entirely new dimension of scientific inquiry. By way of anticipation we may call this dimension the transcendental.

We may express this dimension as a *basic philosophical problem* in a number of ways: It is the problem of cognition or of consciousness. It is the problem of the possibility of objectively valid science. It is the problem of the possibility of a metaphysics – and so on. Regardless of how we express it, the problem is far from being a precise one, laid out in originally derived scientific concepts. Instead, the problem always retains something of the obscure and ambiguous, and this lack of clarity leaves the door open to absurd formulations. This newly opened dimension of knowledge can only with difficulty be put into words and concepts; the old, traditional concepts, alien as they are to

the essence of the new dimension, cannot grasp it; rather, they only misconstrue it.

Thus the modern epoch of philosophy represents a constant effort to penetrate into this new dimension and to arrive at the right concepts, the right ways of asking questions, and the right methods. The road to this goal is long, and it is understandable that modern philosophy, in spite of its intense scientific dedication, has not achieved the one and only philosophy that would measure up to the transcendental motivation. Instead, we get a plurality of systems, each contradicting the other. Has this situation changed for the better in our own times?

Amidst the confusion of our modern philosophies, each one following upon the other, dare we hope there might now be among them one philosophy in which modernity's striving for the transcendental might have achieved complete clarity and provided a solidly formed, apodictically necessary idea of transcendental philosophy? Might it, in addition, lead us to a method for doing solid, rigorously scientific work, and even to a systematic inception of, and progress in, this work?

My answer was already anticipated in my introductory remarks. I cannot do otherwise than see transcendental (or constitutive) phenomenology as the purely elaborated transcendental philosophy that is already doing real scientific work. It is much discussed and much criticized but, properly speaking, is still unknown. Natural and traditional prejudices act as a veil that inhibits access to its real meaning. Far from helping and improving, such criticism has not yet even made contact with it.

My task now is to lay out for you the true meaning of transcendental phenomenology in an evidential way. *Then* [169] we will have the fundamental insights in the light of which the problem of the possibility of philosophical anthropology can be settled.

The easiest place to start is with Descartes' *Meditations*. Let us be guided by their form alone and by what breaks through in them: the will to practice the most extreme kind of scientific radicalism. We shall not pursue the contents of the *Meditations*, which, as we have frequently noted, is often falsified by biased judgments. Rather, we shall try to attain a level of scientific radicalism that can never be unsurpassed. All of modern philosophy springs from Descartes' *Meditations*. Let us transform this historical proposition into a substantive one: Every genuine beginning of philosophy springs from meditation, from the experience of solitary self-reflection. When it is rooted in its origins, an autonomous philosophy (and we live in the age when humanity has awakened to its autonomy) becomes the solitary and radical self-responsibility of the one who is philosophizing. Only in solitude and meditation does one become a philosopher; only in this way is philosophy born in us, emerging of necessity from within us. What others and the tradition accept as knowledge

and scientific foundations is what I, as an autonomous ego,[2] must pursue to its ultimate grounding, and I must do so exclusively in terms of my own sense of its evidentness. This ultimate grounding must be immediately and apodictically evident. Only in this way can I be absolutely responsible; only thus can I justify matters absolutely. Therefore I must let no previous judgment, no matter how indisputable it may seem to be, go unquestioned and ungrounded.

If I seriously try to live up to this demand, I discover to my astonishment something that is self-evident and yet has never been noticed or expressed before, namely that a universal belief in being flows through and sustains my entire life. Quite unnoticed, this belief immediately infiltrates my view of *philosophy* as well. By philosophy I understand, of course, a universal science of the world and, at a more specific level, the distinct disciples that pertain to particular regions of the world, of "the" world. The being of "the" world is what we constantly take for granted as entirely obvious; it is the ever unexpressed presupposition. Its source, to be sure, is universal experience, with its constant certitude about being.

What status does the evidence for this certitude have? The evidence of our experience of *individual* realities frequently fails to hold up. On occasion the certitude that it offers about being turns out to be dubious and [170] is even invalidated as an empty illusion. Why is it that, by contrast, my experiential certitude about the world – the latter taken as the *totality* of realities that are actually in being for me – nevertheless stands unshaken? In point of fact I can never doubt this certitude or even deny it.[3] Is that sufficient for a radical grounding? In the end does not this certitude about being, which inhabits the continuity of our experience of the world, turn out to be a multiplefounded certitude? Have I ever pursued and expounded it? Have I ever inquired responsibly into the sources of validity, and into the import, of experience? No. Thus, without being accounted for, this certitude has sustained all my scientific activity up to now. But it must no longer go unaccounted for. I must submit it to questioning. I cannot even seriously begin an autonomous science without having first justified it apodictically, giving it an ultimate grounding through the activity of raising and answering questions.

Now a further step: Once I put in question the certitude about being that operates in my experience of the world, this certitude can *no longer serve as*

---

[2] Three terms that Husserl uses in this lecture – "ich," "Ich," and "Ego" – are translated respectively as: I, ego, and Ego. When "ich" appears in lower case (or when capitalized only because it begins a sentence), it is generally used in the normal sense of the first person singular. The other two terms, however, have specialized philosophical meanings. When capitalized, *Ich* (in our translation: ego) usually refers to the ego of psycho-physical experience as Husserl understands it, whereas *Ego* (in our translation: Ego) refers to the subject of transcendental experience. However, Husserl twice uses *Ich* and not *Ego* to refer to the subject of transcendental experience (see below).

[3] It is possible (but improbable) that the sentence means: "In point of fact I can never doubt these realities [*sie*] or even deny them."

the basis for forming judgments. Consequently what is demanded of us – or of me the meditating and philosophizing ego – is a *universal epoché* regarding the being of the world, including all the individual realities that one's experience (even one's consistently harmonious experience) submits as actual. What then remains?

The world, we say, is the totality of entities. Hence, am I now standing *face to face with the nothing*? If so, can I even formulate a judgment at all? As regards a basis for making judgments, do I still have any experience at all in which entities are already present for me in originary intuition, prior to all judgment? Our answer is not unlike Descartes' (even if it is not in complete agreement with him): Even though the existence of the world, as what first needs radical grounding, has now become questionable for me and has fallen under the epoché, nonetheless *I* the questioner, the one practicing the epoché, am still here, along with the "I am" of which I am conscious and which I can ascertain immediately and apodictically. From out of myself as the one practicing this epoché I possess an experience that I can immediately and actively answer for. It is not an experience of the world – the validity of my entire world-experience has been put aside – and yet it is still experience. In this experience I grasp myself precisely as ego within the epoché of the world, and I grasp everything that is inseparable from me as this ego. Therefore, in contrast to the being of the world, I as *this* apodictic ego am that which in and of itself is prior, insofar as my being as this ego remains unaffected by whatever status the validity of the world's being, and the justification of that validity, may have. Clearly only as *this* ego [171] can I ultimately account for the being of the world and can I (if at all) achieve a radically responsible science.

Now, a new and important step: It is not for nothing that I have been emphasizing "this ego," since, when I get this far, I realize that *a true revolution* has taken place in my philosophizing ego. *At first*, when beginning my mediation, I was, for myself, this *individual* human being who like a *philosophizing hermit* had temporarily separated himself from his fellow human beings in order to keep a healthy distance from their judgments. But even in so doing, I still base myself upon my experience of the world as something self-evidently in being. But *now* that this world is and must remain in question, so also my being as a human being – amidst other humans and other realities in the world – has to remain in question as well, submitted to the epoché.

Owing to this epoché *human solitude* has become something radically different: it has become *transcendental solitude*, the solitude of the *Ego*. As *Ego* I am for myself not a human being within the world that is in being; rather, I am the ego[4] that places the world in question regarding its entire

[4] Here and in the next sentence Husserl uses *Ich* (capitalized) to refer to the transcendental ego instead of to the ego of psycho-physical experience, as before.

being, and hence too regarding its being in this way or that. Or: I am the ego that certainly continues to live its life within universally available experience but that brackets the validity of the being of that experience. The same holds for all non-experiential modes of consciousness in which the world retains its practical or theoretical validity. The world continues to appear the way it used to appear; life in the world is not interrupted. But the world is now a "bracketed" world, a mere phenomenon, specifically a phenomenon whose validity is that of the stream of experience, of consciousness as such, although this consciousness is now transcendentally reduced. World, in the sense of this universal phenomenon of validity, is obviously inseparable from transcendental consciousness.

With the above we have described what transcendental phenomenology calls the phenomenological reduction. What this refers to is not some *temporary* suspension of belief with regard to the being of the world but one that continues on by an act of the will, a commitment that is binding on me the phenomenologist once and for all. As such, however, it is only the necessary means for the reflective activity of experience and of theoretical judgment, the activity in which a fundamentally new field of experience and knowledge opens up: the transcendental field. What now becomes my focus – and this can happen only through the epoché – is my transcendental Ego, its transcendental *cogitationes*, and thus the transcendentally reduced lived experiences of consciousness in [172] all their typical forms, along with my current *cogitata qua cogitata* as well – everything of which I am presently conscious, as well as the ways in which I am conscious of it, although always within the bounds of the epoché. All of these make up the region of the Ego's transcendental consciousness, both as it currently is and as it remains unified throughout change. Although this is only a beginning, it is a necessary beginning. When carried through, transcendental reflection soon also leads to the transcendental peculiarities of the "I can," to faculties that have to do with habits, and to much more, including the universal phenomenon of validity – the world – taken as a universal totality that persists over against the multiple ways in which one is conscious of it.

Against all expectations, what in fact opens up here – but only through the phenomenological reduction – is a vast field of research. It is first of all a field of immediate, apodictic experience, the constant source and solid ground of all transcendental judgments whether immediate or mediate. This is a field of which Descartes and his successors were oblivious and remained so. To be sure, it was an extraordinarily difficult task to clarify the pure meaning of the transcendental transformation and thereby to highlight the fundamental distinction between, on the one hand, the transcendental Ego (or the transcendental sphere) and, on the other, the human being's ego with its psychical sphere and its worldly sphere. Even after the distinction had been noted and the task

of a transcendental science had achieved its pure meaning, as was the case with Fichte and his successors, it was still extraordinarily difficult to see and exploit the ground of transcendental experience in its infinite breadth. Because German Idealism failed on this point, it devolved into groundless speculations, the unscientific character of which is not a matter of debate and (contrary to the opinion of many today) is not to be commended. In general, it was extraordinarily hard to completely satisfy the demands of the new problem of philosophical method as a means for making philosophy a science based on ultimate accountability. But in the final analysis everything depends on the initial moment of the method, the phenomenological reduction.

The reduction is the means of access to this new realm, so when one gets the meaning of the reduction wrong then everything else also goes wrong. The temptation to misunderstandings here is simply overwhelming. For instance, it seems all too obvious to say to oneself: "I, this human being [*dieser Mensch*], am the one who is practicing the method of a transcendental alteration of attitude whereby one [173] withdraws back into the pure Ego; so can this Ego be anything other than just a mere abstact stratum of this concrete human being, its purely mental [*geistiges*] being, abstracted from the body?" But clearly those who talk this way have fallen back into the naïve natural attitude. Their thinking is grounded in the pregiven world rather than moving within the sphere of the epoché. For, to take oneself as a human being already presupposes an acceptance of validity of the world. What the epoché shows us clearly, however, is that the Ego is the one in whose life-process the apperception "human being," standing within the universal apperception "world," acquires and maintains its sense of being.

Indeed, even if one goes as far as we have now, and holds the new fields of transcendental experience and judgment in sharp separation from the field of the natural world, and even if one already sees that a broad area of possible investigations opens up here, one still does not easily see what it is that such investigations are supposed to accomplish, or that one is called upon to make a genuine philosophy able to stand on its own feet.

How are investigations that have consistently and without interruption maintained the epoché – that is, pure egological investigations – supposed to have any philosophical relevance at all? After all, it is as a human being standing in the world that I pose all my theoretical and practical questions, and also all questions about my fate. Can I give all these up? But must I not do so, if the being of the world is and *remains* subjected to an epoché? This being the case, it would seem that I shall never again return to the world and to all those questions about life for the very sake of which I have philosophized and have striven for scientific knowledge as a rational and radical reflection upon the world and human existence.

Nonetheless, let us consider whether the transcendental reduction's consistent renunciation of the world in the transcendental reduction is not, after all, the necessary path to a true and valid knowledge of the world, a knowledge which can be achieved only through this epoché. Let us not forget the context of meaning of my [*Cartesian*] *Meditations*, in which, for me, the epoché received its meaning and epistemological function. The renunciation of the world, the "bracketing of the world," did not mean that henceforth the world was no longer our focus at all, but that the world had to become our focus in a new way, at a whole level deeper. What we have renounced, then, is only *the naïveté* by which we allow the common experience of the world to be already given to us both as in being as such as as being thuse or so according to the case. This naïveté is dissolved if we, as [174] autonomous subjects – and this was the impelling motive – responsibly interpret the way experiencing brings about this acceptance of validity and if we seek a form of rational insight in which we take responsibility for it and are able to determine its consequences.

Now, instead of just having the world naïvely and posing naïve questions to that world, that is, questions about truth in the usual sense, we will pose new questions to it, questions directed to the world purely as world of experience and to the therewith associated consciousness of the world – that is to say, to a world which gains its meaning and acceptance purely in us, and first of all in myself and from myself. – In myself, be it noted [*nota bene*], as transcendental Ego.

But this is precisely what we have to bring into clear focus. The being of the world possesses self-evidentness for me only insofar as that self-evidentness is my own, is within my own experience, taking place in the life of my own consciousness. Therein lies the source of all possible meaning that objective worldly facts, whatever their kind, have for me. Through the transcendental epoché, however, I see that that all worldly entities, and so too my existence as a human being, are there for me only as the content of a a certain experience of apperception that has the modality of certitude-about-being. As transcendental Ego, I am the one performing and living through this apperception. The apperception is an event that happens in me – admittedly one hidden from reflection – in which world and human persons are first constituted as in being. Also, every evidentness which I am able to attach to something in the world, every process of verification, whether scientific or prescientific, resides primarily in myself, in the transcendental Ego. Certainly I am indebted to others for quite a bit, perhaps for almost everything, but they are first of all *others for me*, others who get from me whatever meaning and validity they have for me. And only because I possess their meaning and validity from out of myself can they be of help to me as fellow subjects. Thus, as transcendental Ego I am the absolute subject of, and the subject responsible for *all* of my validations of being. When, by virtue of the transcendental reduction, I become aware of myself as

this kind of Ego, I assume a position above all worldly being [*weltliches Sein*], above my own human being and human living. This absolute position *above* everything that holds true for me and that can ever hold true for me, along with all its possible content – precisely and necessarily this is what must be the philosophical position. And this is the position that the phenomenological reduction provides me. I have lost nothing that was there for me in the state of naïveté, and in particular nothing that showed itself to me as existing reality. Rather: In the absolute attitude [*Einstellung*] [175] I now recognize the world itself, I recognize it for the very first time as what it continously was for me and had to be for me according to its essential nature: *as a transcendental phenomenon.* Precisely in this way I have brought into play a new dimension of questions never asked before and precisely about this existent reality: Only through the answering of these questions can concrete, full being and the definitive, complete truth come to light *about this world.*

It is clear from the outset that the world – whose acceptance in the natural attitude was necessarily that of the whole of what simply exists – in fact has its truth only as a transcendentally relative truth, whereas being in its absolute form can pertain *only to transcendental subjectivity* ? But let us be careful here. Certainly the world that is in being for me, the world about which I have always had ideas and spoken about meaningfully, has meaning and is accepted as valid by me because of my own apperceptive performances because of these experiences that run their course and are combined precisely in those performances – as well as other functions of consciousness, such as thinking. But is it not a pieces of foolishness [*eine tolle Zumutung*] to suppose that world has being because of some performance of mine? Clearly, I must make my formulation more precise. In my ego there is formed, from out of the proper sources of transcendental passivity and activity, my "*representation of the world,*" my "*picture of the world,*" whereas *outside of me,* naturally enough, there is *the world itself.*

But is this really a good way of putting it? Does this talk about outer and inner, if it makes any sense at all, receive its meaning from anywhere else than from my formation and my preservation of meaning? Should I forget that the totality of everything that I can ever think of as in being resides within the universal realm of consciousness, within my realm, that of the Ego, and indeed within what is *for me* real or possible?

Although the answer is compelling, it is still unsatisfying. Recognition of the transcendental *relativity* of all being, and accordingly of the entire world that is in being, may be unavoidable, but when it is formally set forth in this way, it is completely unintelligible. And it will remain so if from the start we allow ourselves to use the kind of argumentation that has always been the curse of the so-called "theory of knowledge."

But have we not already concretely disclosed transcendental subjectivity [176] as a field of experience and a field of cognitions [*Erkenntnisse*] related to that as their ground? In doing this, have we not, in fact, actually opened up the way to solve the new transcendental puzzle of the world? This transcendental puzzle is quite different from all other puzzles about the world in the usual sense; it consists precisely in the unintelligibility with which transcendental relativity strikes us from the very start as well as when we discover the transcendental attitude and the transcendental Ego. The starting point is not at all an end point. In any case, it is clear now what we have to do to transform it into *something understandable*, and thus to arrive at a really concrete and radically grounded knowledge of the world. We must embark on a systematic study of concrete transcendental subjectivity, and specifically we must pose the question of how transcendental subjectivity in itself [*in sich*] brings about the sense and validity of the objective world I, as Ego, must take as my scientific theme – and thereby make it an essential scientific theme for the very first time – my own self and my entire sphere of consciousness as regards both its own essential structure and the structural processes of producing and maintaining sense and acceptance that are carried out and to be carried out in that sphere. As a philosopher, I certainly do not want to remain in the sphere of merely empirical inquiry. So as a first step I need to comprehend essential forms of my conscious lived experiences in terms of their immanent temporality, or in Cartesian terms, I need to comprehend the stream of my "*cogitationes*." These lived experiences are what they are as "intentional" lived experiences. Each individual *cogito*, and every synthesis of such *cogitos* as a synthesis into the unity of a new *cogito*, is a *cogito* with its own *cogitatum* [thing thought], and this latter – taken *qua cogitatum* [as the thing thought], precisely the way it emerges as *cogitatum* – is, in accordance with its own nature, inseparable from the *cogito*. But on the other side, of course, we have to pursue the essential connection between the *cogitationes* and their corresponding faculties. The "I can," the "I am doing," and finally the "I have an abiding faculty for" are occurrences within essence, as is every capacity for being active, including that ego-consciousness. Even the ego, which at first appears to be an empty center, is the name for a transcendental problem all its own, that of the various properties of faculties. [177] Indeed, the first issue is research into the correlation between consciousness as lived experience and what it is conscious of as such (the *cogitatum*). Here we must not overlook the decisive point As Ego, I must direct my gaze toward a bewildering multiplicity of subjective modes of consciousness, which as such belong in each case to *one and the same* object that I am conscious of and intend *in* those modes of consciousness; and these modes of consciousness belong together thanks to the *synthesis of identity*, that necessarily enters into the process. One example is the multiplicity of modes of appearance that exist within the perceiving

observation of a thing, by means of which it becomes immanent in consciousness as *this one thing*. This thing that is naïvely given to us as one thing, and possibly as something permanent and completely unaltered – becomes the *transcendental clue* that leads us to the systematic reflective study of manifolds in consciousness that essentially pertain to any one thing. This is the case for every entity, for every individual reality, and also for the world as a total phenomenon. The mere fact that there actually is an apodictic and essential set of laws governing correlation was already a completely new discovery of unprecedented importance. But these are only the beginning steps (although these call for the most comprehensive descriptive investigations) in a progression of ever new levels of transcendental investigation, investigations which produce their solid groundedness and their concrete and apodictic evidence on the basis of concrete experience and description.

The possibility of carrying out all these investigations depends on discovering the method of correlation-research, the method for questioning back behind intentional objectivity [*intentionale Gegenständlichkeit*]. Genuine analysis of consciousness is, so to say, the hermeneutic of conscious life, where the latter is taken as that which continously intends entities (identities), and constitutes them within its own self in manifolds of consciousness that pertain to those entities in essential ways. One must put the thumscrews not to nature (as Bacon argued), in order to force her to betray her secrets, but to consciousness, or the transcendental Ego. The fact that such a problematic and method could remain completely hidden, is due to an essential peculiarity of conscious life itself. Which is to say: While the ego in the natural, worldly attitude is always in one way or other directed to and involved with some object that is already given to it, as is always the case in the natural-worldly attitude, is continuously directed to some objectivity that is pregiven to it, and is in some way occupying itself with it, [178] the whole streaming on of life and the production of its unity that takes place within it remains, in accordance with its nature, anonymous and, so to speak, hidden. But that which is hidden can be uncovered, for in accordance with its nature, the ego can reflectively turn its thematic gaze around; it can intentionally bend its questioning back around and through systematic explanations make its own production of unity visible and understandable.

Given the above, we now also understand that the turning away from a naïve investigation of the world to a self-exploration of the transcendental, egological realm of consciousness does not at all signify a turning away from the world or a transition into a theoretical area of speciality that is estranged from the world and of no interest. On the contrary, it is this turn that makes possible a really radical investigation into the world; indeed, as we shall see later, it makes possible a radically scientific investigation into what absolutely and in the ultimate sense exists [*des absoluten, des im letzten Sinne Seienden,*

of the absolute entity, of that which is in an ultimate sense]. Once we have recognized the deficiencies of the naïve attitude, this becomes the only possible path to take in order to establish sciences based on genuine rationality. Concretely expressed, it is the path to the only possible philosophy that is radically grounded.

Of course, this great and overwhelming task requires an extraordinarily difficult method for abstractively stratifying the transcendental sphere and for the problematics corresponding to that. It is necessary to have a fixed working procedure [*in einer festen Arbeitsordnung*] if one is to ascend from one level of problems to the next level higher.

Above all, this entails that we abstract, at a first level of investigation, from the transcendental production of empathy. This is the only way to get at the essential presuppositions for understanding the production of empathy and thereby overcoming the most embarrassing of unintelligibilities – in a word, for dispelling the initially misleading illusion of a transcendental solipsism. Naturally this cannot be accomplished through empty arguments but through concrete explications of intentionality.

Here in the ego's transcendental realm of knowing, a fundamental and essential distinction shows up between what is personally one's own, so to speak, and what is other than oneself. It is from out of myself as the one constituting the meaning of being within the content of my own private ego that I attain the transcendental other as someone just like me; and in this way I attain the open and endless whole of *transcendental intersubjectivity* , [179] precisely as that which, within its communalized transcendental life, first constitutes the world as an *objective* world, as a *world that is identical for everyone.*

This, then, is the path offered by transcendental phenomenology, a path leading away from the naïveté of everyday natural life and away from philosophy in the old style, towards absolute transcendental knowledge of whatever exists at all.

What we must constantly keep in mind is that what this transcendental phenomenology does is nothing other than to interrogate *the one* world, exactly that which is always for us the real world (the world that holds true for us, shows itself to us, the only world that has meaning for us). Transcendental phenomenology uses intentionality to interrogate the sources of that world's meaning and validity for us, the sources that comprise the true meaning of its being. That is precisely the way and the only way, to gain access to all conceivable problems about the world, and beyond them, to the transcendentally disclosed problems of being, not just the old problems raised to the level of their transcendental sense.

Once anyone has seriously understood what is aimed at here, what has been here opened up in concrete work and with the most compelling evidence as

systematic theory, then, there can be no doubt that there is only *one* definitive philosophy, only *one* form of definitive science, which is the science elaborated by the the originary method of transcendental phenomenology.

* * *

This implicitly answers the question of whether any anthropology, regardless of the meaning its function may have, can ever be a philosophical anthropology, and in particular, the question of whether there can be any legitimacy to a philosophy whose grounding rests on the essence of human beings in any form whatever.

For it is immediately clear that any doctrine at all of human being, whether empirical or apriori, presupposes the existing world or a world that could be in being. A philosophy that takes its start from human existence falls back into that naïveté the overcoming of which has, in our opinion, been the whole meaning of modernity. Once this naïveté has finally been unmasked for what it is, once the genuine transcendental problem has been arrived at in its apodictic necessity, there can be no going back.

I cannot help seeing the decision for a transcendental phenomenology as definitive, and I cannot help branding all philosophies that call themselves phenomenological as abberations which cannot attain the level of authentic philosophy.

[180] The same holds for every *objectivism* of whatever kind, for every turning to the object instead of turning back to transcendental subjectivity. The same holds for every *ontological idealism*, which like Scheler's, claims that my *Logical Investigations*, with its renewed justification of *eidos* and of apriori or ontological knowledge gives them licence to pursue a naïve metaphysics instead of following the inner tendency of that book toward investigations directed to subjective constitution. The same goes for a return to any kind of metaphysics in the old style. Instead of being a step forward, this return to metaphysics represents a failure to confront the immense and inescapable task of the present age: at last to bring the meaning of modern philosophy to clarity and truth.

Unfortunately, I can only touch briefly on the already mentioned parallelism between the human being and the [transcendental] Ego, between psychology of consciousness and subjectivity, *interior psychology,* and *transcendental phenomenology*. The former is a psychology of the subjectivity of consciousness, purely grasped (or a psychology of the personality, the latter taken in the unique and meaningful form it has in intentional psychology), and a psychology that uses the rational, that is eidetic, method.

The actual development of psychology in modern times did not come about as the unfolding of a specialized positive science. Rather, until well into the

nineteenth century it had the intention of providing a transcendental grounding for philosophy in general. Even after it became an autonomous discipline, many continued to maintain this as its function. Such a constant interwovenness of psychology and philosophy during the age of transcendental motivation would not have been possible without there being some basis in the matter being dealt with. This point is also indicated in the fact that radical efforts to reform psychology – like the introduction of intentionality into so-called descriptive psychology (the form of interior psychology in the Lockean tradition), as well as the stimulus that the human-sciences orientation gave Dilthey to try to develop a psychology of the personality in its social-historical existence. These have created the preconditions needed for a new and deeper understanding of the transcendental problem and specifically for a transcendental method that is indigenous to psychology. Conversely, transcendental phenomenology's breakthrough to its own genuine method – and this within philosophy – had a retroactive effect in the direction of reforming psychology, and [moving toward] the true meaning of an interior psychology. Its basic guiding problem, that of the psychological-phenomenological constitution of the world as [181] a human "objectivation" ["*Vorstellung*," representation], now emerges for the first time, along with the method for explicating the horizon of consciousness, a method that follows clues coming from the *cogitatum*, from the intentional object. Yet all this remained *terra incognita* to Brentano and his school.

To be sure, this remarkable relation, this parallelism between an intentional psychology and a transcendental phenomenology naturally calls for clarification. We must come to understand, on ultimate transcendental grounds, why psychology – or anthropology, if you wish – is in fact not just a positive science along with the natural sciences, but rather has an *intrinsic affinity* with philosophy, with transcendental philosophy.

This clarification has made also possible and brought the following to light: When one has revealed intersubjectivity to interior psychology (which ultimately is anthropology in the pure, intellectual sense), as has now become possible, and when this has been developed as a *rational* science in unconditioned universality and breadth (as has happened from the beginning for the rational sciences of nature) – then a spontaneous tendency begins to impel psychologists to give up their naïve orientedness to the world and to understand themselves as transcendental philosophers. We could even say: Once we take the idea of a positive rational knowledge of the world and think it through to the end, once we think our way through to the ultimate grounding of such a science, at that point any positive science of the world changes over into a transcendental science of the world. Positive science remains distinct from philosophy only so long as the knower remains stuck in finite matters. But these are large topics for a lecture.

INDEX

compiled by Richard E. Palmer

This is an index of items from the text of the volume; it does not index the footnotes. Also, simple mentions of Husserl or Heidegger in the text are not indexed, nor are references to the *Britannica* article, the Amsterdam Lectures, *Being and Time*, or *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Authors of books have been referenced but not book titles. The following abbreviations have been used in this index:

Hu = Husserl
H. = Heidegger
phen. = phenomenology or phenomenological
phil. = philosophy or philosophical
psych. = psychology or psychological

a priori, the 116, 152ff., 186, 192, 230, 233, 235, 399f., 440
a priori concepts 231f., 243; insights 153; knowledge 487, 499
a priori of a possible world 99; of the factual world 156; of the world 153
a priori ontology 99, 123
a priori phen. 149, 218, 233, 241
a priori psych. 95, 123, 233, 241
a priori research, the need for 122
a priori science/s 95, 98f., 149, 151f., 155, 159, 165, 175f., 191f., 216, 230, 233f., 281
a priori truths 216, 232
absolute ego/s 52, 132, 139
absolute existence 497, 498
absolute foundations 173, 175, 204f., 249f.
absolute idea of a genuine human life 177
absolute knowing 444
absolute norms 193
absolute science 150, 245, 253
absolute self-experience 128
absolute subject 98, 248, 494f. *See also* transcendental Ego
absolute truths the goal of phil. 487
Absolute, the 444
absolutely universal ontology 152, 156
absolutism 193
accident, concept of 372
all-embracing absolute science 253; apperception 244f.; eidetic ontology 175; epoché 172; intersubjectivity 248;
all-embracing phen. 229, 234f.
all-embracing phil., phen. as 158, 177, 192
all-embracing psych. of reason 235; science of empirical fact 176; self-reflection 177; theoretical interest 239
all-embracingness of intersubjectivity 252; of subjectivity 249
analogy 276
anthropological-psych. knowledge 471
anthropologism 456f., 485f.
anthropology 284, 455, 485, 500; affinity with transcendental phil. 500; as ground for metaphysics 430, 454, 469; as ground for method 487; as ground for philosophy 485, 499
anthropology, eksistential 372
anthropology, philosophical 287, 336, 429f., 456f.
anti-Semitism 31
anticipation and becoming 387; of death 360
anticipatory resolution 374
antipsychologism *See* psychologism
antitheses, resolution of 67, 101, 178
apodictic insight 487
apperceiving conscious life-process 245
apperception 129f., 244, 246, 378
Aquinas 285
Aristotle 3f., 20, 148, 275f., 291, 355, 438f., 459, 463
Augustine 300

authentic ability to be 361; disclosedness 370; historicity 411; present 387
authentic phil. 459, 463; as anthropological 485; as transcendental phen. 499
authenticity 371f.; of Dasein's eksistence 369
autonomous ego/subjects 490, 494
average everydayness 287, 300

Bacon 151, 497
Baumgarten 150
Becker, C.H. 19
Becker, O. 25, 104, 195
being, absolute form of 495; clarification of 108; concept of 431; constitution of 425; disclosure of 297; finitude of 408; ground of unquestionable 170f.; meaning of 276, 291, 422; object's kind of 112; question of 138, 278, 459f., 462; rules all there-being 470; relativity of 495; sense of 170; as transcendentally disclosed 498; understanding of 398, 426, 438
being and the constitution of world 138
Being as such seldom in question 466
being of an implement 314, 315
being of Dasein as care 350
being of entities 108f., 296
Being of the being or thing, the 459
being of the world 491ff.
being with others 409
being-historical, the structure of 406
being-in 308, 336
being-in-a-world 309, 311, 313, 315, 329, 338, 354, 379, 393
Being-question, the 459
being-with 329
belief in being, universal 222f., 490
Bergson 291, 301
Berkeley 187, 236
Biemel 36f., 65, 68, 80, 145, 207
blindness, Hu's 481
Blochmann 25, 140f.
Bolzano 123
bracketing 246; *see also* epoché
Breeur 258
Brentano 3f., 45, 94f., 97, 121f., 213, 219, 500

Cairns 27, 30
care 306, 350, 364, 373, 375, 377, 381, 471
Cassirer 424, 482
categorial intuition 5,132, 424
Catholicism, H.'s 8f.
causalistic conceptions 101, 193
certitude about being, questioned 491
Chisholm 65
circle, transcendental/vicious 244, 345
circularity, belongs to understanding 376
co-existence of a concrete subjectivity 115
cogito/cogitata/cogitatum 89, 91, 236, 492, 496, 500
cognition 236, 488
communities of egos/minds/subjects 96, 150, 164, 170, 173, 218, 233, 240f., 247, 249
community experience 67, 160, 184, 221
community life, personal 89
community of intersubjectivity 94; of selves 111; of transcendental life 498
concept of Being, not needed 463, 465
concepts and the self-giving of entities 464
concepts, a priori 231
concern 305f., 396f; experiencing and knowing 310; temporality of practical c. 394; time that goes with 416
concern-for-others 330f.
concrete wholeness of the human being 138
Conrad-Martius 104, 195
conscience 363f., 366ff.; as an intentionality 362; the call of 374; ontological analysis of 362
conscious life 243, 245; allsided horizon of 218; hiddenness of 497
conscious subjectivity 148
consciousness 163, 171; the all-embracing subjectivity of 237; as performative 461; categories of 231; coherently interrelated 229; constitutive functions of 242f., ego-pole and 224; field of 148; functions of 234, 250; hermeneutic of 497; horizonal 466; life of 219, 222, 239f., 245; life of 168, 228; need for a subjective turn toward 461; of being an "I" 231; ontologically undefined 303; phen. reflection on 221; problem of 488; pure analysis of 219; science of 149; subjectivity of 242, 488; synthesis in 228; synthetic character of 209; synthetic cosmos of lived experiences in 226; the entire sphere of 496; the reification of 422; the return to 108f.; transcendental 492; transcendental subjectivity of 250; two-sidedness of 225
consciousness in itself 378,
constitutes, what does it mean? 395
constituting subjectivity 464
constitution 47, 138, 154, 189; getting at the real problems of 461; of being 425, 439; of world 245
constitutive analysis of time inadequate 418
constitutive intentional operations 194
constitutive phen. 355, 415, 460, 485f.
Copernican revolution 246, 252, 441, 491
Copernican turn 235
correlation-research 497; *see* intentionality
cosmos, place of man in 456
creative intuition, infinite 427
curiosity 348, 392

Dasein 205, 277f., 282f., 287, 289f. 299, 301, 305ff., 309, 326, 328, 336, 365, 374, 403f., 409, 411, 414, 416, 432, 446, 468-72, 485f.
death anticipation of 360f.; existential conception of 359f.; inevitability of 358; Hu's remark on 359; structure of 358
deconstruction 425, 429
deliberation 398f.

Descartes 45, 66f., 89, 96f., 108, 117ff., 123, 138, 148, 158, 167f., 179, 187f., 193f., 204f., 219, 236f., 290f., 301, 322, 325f., 353, 421, 424, 428, 488, 491f.; all modern phil. springs from 489; D. according to H. 323; his idea of being 324; his transcendental turn 167, 236
descriptions, H.'s d. unfruitful 450
descriptions of psych. exper. 132
Destruktion 289f., 425, 429
Deutschbein 19
Dilthey 205, 209, 301, 415, 430, 455, 485, 500; his goal of understanding life 414; pioneering work on historicity 407;
directionality 145, 327
disclosedness 346; and Dasein 336f.; as understanding 341; resolution and 370; temporality of 386, 392; of the world 338
disclosive entrance into realm of beings 468
disclosive experiencing 231
disclosure, original 340
discoveredness 321
discursiveness 294, 346f., 392, 294
disposition 339, 347
doubling, semblance of 243f.
dread 349, 358, 389ff.
Duns Scotus 8

ego 15, 17, 166, 214, 218, 233, 305, 428, 444, 451f., 490; as apodictic and prior to the world 491; as center of acts 209; as immanent time 450; as pure mind-substance 237; in H. 284; life of 428; of the other 250; of pure psych. 46; psych. 132; study of 224; transcendental 130ff., 250; *see also* transcendental Ego
ego similar to a substance for Kant 450ff.
ego cogito 89, 97, 120, 148, 187, 224, 290, 353, 421, 491; in Descartes and Kant 428
ego-consciousness 496
ego-pole 224
ego-subject 217f.
egoic being 246; endless e. community 250; life-processes 92, 246
egological investigations 493
egological phen. 93, 229, 232
egological reductiion 93, 115
egological transcendental reduction 133
eidetic analysis 112, 114, 116, 166, 243
eidetic essences 242, 246
eidetic intuition 177, 193, 210, 289
eidetic laws 166; meaning 241f.;
eidetic ontology 175
eidetic phen. 156, 170, 186, 190, 192, 194, 234, 242, 251, 253
eidetic phen. psychology 204, 206, 249, 252
eidetic phen. research 242
eidetic reduction 30, 66f., 84, 92, 165, 174, 186, 205, 230ff.
eidetic research needed 279
eidetic science 165, 186, 230, 233, 244, 249, 253
eidetic sig. of phen.-psych. structures 248
eidetic synthesis 225; theory 166, 240; universality 169, 170; variation 206
eidetic-psychological phen. 233
eidetically universal question 278
eidetics of phen. intersubjectivity 248f.
eksistence 298f., 354
eksistential anthropology 372
Eksistential constitution of the open 337
eksistential interpretation 357; method of 373
eksistential structure of Dasein 138
eksistentiality 283
eksistentially understanding gaze 381
empathy 115, 229, 331ff.
empiricism 101f., 193f.
encounter, ego can 305
enigma of being 414; of motion
entities as such 108f., 147
entities, the being of 296
entity in which "world" is constituted 138
epistemological circle 98
epistemology, as not in *Critique of Pure Reason* 469; versus ontology 426
epoché 91, 97, 163, 184ff., 191, 206, 222f., 235, 491, 493; all-embracing 172; of existing world 128; meaning and function of 494; phenomenological 246, 252; transcendental 171ff., 244, 247; a universal 491
Ereignis 16
essence 146; of the being 431
essence of Being the essence of Dasein 469
essences, knowledge of 153
essential element in Hu according to H. 475
essential form, grasping the 488
essential forms of lived experiences 496
essential probs. of phil. traceable to man 456
essential types 241
essentiality of essence for H. and Hu 460f.
everydayness, analytic of 470; temporal meaning of 384f., 404f.
Everyone 362f.; eksistential character of 334f., is intersubjectivity, says Hu 419
everyone-self, the 380
everyone/everydayness 329
evidentness of the world and trans. Ego 494
exactness and exact psych. 233f.
experience: field of 230, 245; of community 221; of others 162, 164, 185; of the self 111; of something internal 222; phenomenological 231; pure phen. 221
experiencing as form of concern 310
explication 344
extension 407
external world, provability of 351

factical self 143
facticity 305f.
faculties are intentional faculties 467
fallenness 349, 379; temporality of 392
fantasy variation 231; *see also* imaginative variation

fate 409ff.
fear 340f., 389ff.
Festschrift for Hu's 70th birthday 28f.
Fichte 493
Findlay 65
finite future, a 383
finite knowledge presupposes Being 445
finite transcendence 426
finitude 458f.; of being 408; of Dasein 472; of human beings 458, 471; of human knowledge 441; a mode of Being 467; no need for this problem 445; primordial problematic of 470f.; rel. to Being not obvious 462; self-evident 468; working out the nature of 471
Fink 69
Finke 8
First Philosophy 108, 147ff., 177, 192, 214, 438
forbearance 331
form of life, altering of one's 252
formal-ontological, obtaining the 461
formstyle 231
foundational method 217
foundations crisis of exact sciences 99f., 149f., 155, 192
free openness of being 409; for death 409
free variation of examples 216
freedom 290
freeing-up 410
functioning subjectivity 234
fundamental ontology 425, 431, 470; time and finitude in 428
Garvin 36f., 40
gaze, existentially understanding 381
Geiger 104, 195
genesis, active 495; passive 166; subjective 189
genetic determinations of psych. exper. 132
genetic phenomenology 166f.
Gibson 62, 206
God needs no explicative intuition 427
God's explicative intuition 443
Greek ontology 290
Greek philosophy 107, 194
guilt 374

habituality, presupposed 405; of self 112
habitus 372
Hartmann 19, 141, 144, 482
hearing 346f.
Hegel 290, 421
Heidegger 5ff., 17, 20, 27, 57f., 140, 142; as antipodes of all Hu stood for 30; criticisms of Hu 18; late remarks on Husserl 2f.
Heidegger letters to: Blochmann 25, 140f.; Hu 24f., 45f., 53f., 136f.; Jaspers 17, 22ff., 43, 141; Löwith 17; Mahnke 141; Misch 141; Richardson 211
Heidegger, Fritz 42ff.
Heidegger's dedication of SZ to Hu 20f.
Heidegger's 1927 note to Hu 22
Heidegger's paradoxical speaking 410
Heidegger's phen. as totally different 481
Heidegger's realism 351
Héring 196, 213
Hicks 30
hermeneutic of conscious life 497
hermeneutical "as" 426
hermeneutical discussion 323
hermeneutical basis life itself in Dilthey 414
hermeneutical intuition 16
hermeneutical situation 357, 375
hermeneutics of Dasein 421
Héring 105
Hicks 30
hiddenness of conscious life 497
Hildebrand 195
historical possibilities 290
historical science and Dasein's historicity 414
historicity 17; as ontological question 415; authentic 411; basic structure of 408; in terms of temporality 407; of Dasein 414; only humans have 410; ontological understanding of 406; ordinary understanding of 407
history and inauthentic Dasein 413
history of meaning of being 289
Hobbes 219
hope: on hoping 390; "what may I hope?" is a wrong question 462
Hopkins 479
horizon 291; and time 417, explicating 500; pure 446
horizon-consciousness 226f., 466
horizonal disclosures 145
Hölderlin 14
human being in the world an irruption 467
human existence falls back into the natural attitude 499
humans as center of the cosmos? 457
Hume 94, 117, 119, 187, 194f., 219, 236, 427, 439, 445
Husserl addition to the title page of *SZ* 30
Husserl letters to: Heidegger 6f., 9-14, 25, 27f., 58, 140; Hicks 30; Ingarden 24, 29f., 201f.; Jensen 44; Mahnke 24, 30f.; Natorp 8f.; Otto 9; Pfänder 23, 29, 203, (translation) 479-483; Pos 200, Rickert 27
Husserl note from Hu IX: 598-599, 145
Husserl rel. to H. explained by Hu 479f.
Husserl's funeral 32
Husserl's private disappointment with H. 482
Husserl's transcription of comments by H. 142f.
Husserl, Gerh. 105, 196
Husserl, Mrs. 137

idea of phen. 107, 147, 397
ideal worlds 169, 240ff.
idealism 101, 193
identical essences 170
identification 320f.
identifying syntheses 225
imagination as temporal 428; transcendental

power of 428, 453
imaginative variation 154, 226f., 230f., 240f., 245
immanent temporal horizon 220, 428, 451f.
imperfection of human beings 459
implement 393, 395ff.; being of 314f.
implemental matrix 316f., 319
inauthentic Dasein and world-history 413
infinite creative intuition 427f.
Ingarden 24, 29f., 104, 201, 204
Ingarden letter to Hu 204
Ingarden's memoir on Hu 55f.
inner experience 253
insight, apodictic 205, 487
insights, a priori 153
intelligibility of entities 125
intentional analyses 123, 162, 219, 226f., 228; constitution 95, 100, 175; of immanent temporality 220; originality of 252;
intentional experience 67, 163, 184f.; faculties 467; life 164, 190, 220; questioning behind objectivity 497
intentional process 246; description of 221
intentional psych. 229; psychic processes 166; questioning 497; relation 113; research 229; structures 112
intentionality 27, 66, 85, 90ff., 94, 100, 110, 114, 122, 161, 164, 183f., 186, 194, 216f., 219, 223f., 226, 229, 233ff., 239, 245, 249, 288, 310, 386, 400f.; as introduction into descriptive psych. 500; as such 124; H.'s avoidance of this term 382; of self-consciousness 288
interior psych. 500
internal time-consciousness 428
interpretation 344; method of existential 373
interpretive violence 429, 453
intersubjective community 94; experience 88ff.; experience of other psychic lives 111; lived experiences 115; psych. eidetics 249; reduction 115, 132, 186; time as public time 417; transcendental experience 132; transcendental reduction 133
intersubjectivity 93, 94, 191f., 229f., 236, 500
intuition: and reflection 216; in Kant's sense 294; of absolute norms 193f.; of beings 442; of pure consciousness 148; empirical borrowing from 121; finite 426; God's 443; infinite creative 427; originarily giving 102; originating 426; phen. 246; temporal meaning of 401; time as pure, finite 448; universal 150, 230
intuitions, actual 232
intuitive experience 88f.
intuitivus derivatus 426
intuitivus originarius 426
involvement 320f., 394f.

Jaspers 17, 22ff., 42ff., 137, 140f., 372
Jensen 37, 44
just-there 316, 360, 396, 399
just-there, perception of the 310
just-thereness 317; in time 406
justification 362

Kaegi 436
Kant 102, 108, 141f., 148, 151, 179, 194, 210f., 273, 280, 290f., 294, 379, 424f., 427ff., 439f., 442, 445, 450, 452ff., 469; as fundamental ontologist 427f.; phil. significance of 425; undermines the First Critique 457
Kant's "I think" 378
Kaufmann 105, 196
Kisiel 3, 18, 141
knowing: absolute k. a contradiction 444; as a mode of Dasein 310; of the being of beings 445; transcendental theory of 250
knowledge 309, 439, 442f.; finitude of 426, 441f.
Kockelmans 199
Kuki 137, 142

Landgrebe 40, 42, 45, 50f., 69, 137
Lask 4f.
Leibniz 123, 150ff., 439
Lessing 22
life: Dilthey's phil. understanding of 414; of consciousness 244; of the ego 428; of the psyche 162
life-phil. a new form of anthropology 485
life-process 217, 246, 248; as constituting world 244; of Ego 493; of the ego 225; intentional sense of 224
life-world 86
Lipps 196
Litt 105
lived but unthematized constitution 464
lived experience 15f., 110ff., 114f., 225, 492; of perceiving 126; essential forms of 496; in consciousness 228
lived space 403f.
lived world 313, 315, 318, 326, 398f.
living temporality 244
Locke 45, 66, 94, 96f., 117ff., 121f., 168, 187, 219, 237
Locke's psychologism 167, 236
logos, the truth of 355
Lombaerts 436
Lotze 123
Löwith 17

Mach 213
Mahnke 24, 29ff., 103, 137, 139ff., 195
man himself already pregiven 446
manifest, Hu's objections to this word 465ff.
manifolds of consciousness 496
mathematical natural science 399, 488
mathematics 488
mathesis universalis 154f.
meaning 381; and validity 127; of being 278, 281, 288f., 422; of the being 431; of care 375; of reality 354; production of 248; requires an understanding of being 350

mental life as such 217
mental lived experiences 220
mere looking, meaning of 315
metaphysica generalis 446
metaphysics 101, 157, 193, 425, 429, 439, 458; and problem of foundation-laying 471; anthropology and 469; *Critique of Pure Reason* as 469; of metaphysics 425; mythical 250; traditional concept of 438
method 375; of eksistential interpretation 373; of transcendental phen. 486; of transcendental phil. 487
methodological clarity for H. 356
methodological grounding for phil. in anthropology 487
mind as cognitive substance 237
minds 242; *see also* communities of minds
Misch 141
mode of being: of constituting 138; of Dasein 143; of an entity with "world" 138; of mathematics 242; of what constitutes 143
mode of experiencing, a change of 252
modernism 8
modes of appearance 111, 126f., 227
modes of being 278
modes of consciousness 496
mood 337f., 391

National Socialism 32
Natorp 7, 9, 13
natural apprehension of the world 287
natural attitude 168, 172f., 225, 444
natural focus of consciousness 238
natural focus of empirical psych. 242
natural science and psych. 67, 183, 189
naturalism, of mental life 220
nature, spiritualization of 157; the being of 313
nearby, the 325
negativity of Dasein 365
NeoKantianism 424
new beginnings in Hu and H. 431f.
noein 355
noetic-noema 235, *see* intentionality
not-ness, obscurity of 365f.
Nothing as correlatum 446
now as always-already-now 418

object: always just-thereness in H. 403; constitution of the being of 308
objectification 320f.
objective time 220
objective truth 242
objectivism 101f. 193f., 499
objectivistic idea of phil. 487
Ochsner 9
Odebrecht 104, 196
ontological 282; analysis of Dasein 285ff., 289; comprehension of being 426; definition of world 322; disciplines 152
ontological foundation, absolute 249f.
ontological genesis of the theor. attitude 397
ontological ground 243; of idealism 499; idealism of Scheler 499; knowledge 438, 440, 499; sense of any entity 118; structure 284; synthesis 427f., 445; understanding of historicity 406
ontologism 101; and transcendentalism 178, 193
ontology 67, 150, 175, 280f., 297, 313; fundamental question of 422; Hu's o. as traditional 326; fundamental 211; Kant as laying the groundwork for 450; Kant wants to replace o. with transcendental phil. 447; medieval 275; of Dasein 287, 289; of the whole human being 138, 143; of world, Cartesian 323; phen. 421; phen. as means of access to 297; universal positive 123
openness of being free 409
ordinary concept of time covers it up 417
original essence of time 452
originating intuition 426, 443
other: analogous to my ego 232; ego of 229; subjectivity of the 245; transcendental 498
others are others for me 494;
Otto 9, 13

parallelisms: human being & transcendental Ego 499; intentional psych. & transcendental phen. 500; interior psych. & transcendental phen. 499; psych. of consciousness & subjectivity 499
paralogism of substantiality 451
parenthecizing 246; *see also* epoché
Parmenides 108, 148
passive genesis 166, 194, 495
pedagogical significance of pure psych. 133
perception 145f.; of external things 245; of the just-there 310
perceptual present, analysis of 239
perennial phil. 179
personality of H. incomprehensible 482
Pfänder 23, 29, 104, 195, 203f.; letter to Hu 203, 479-483
phenomenalism 207
phenomenality 218
phenomenological analysis of perceptions 114; attitude 110, 444; constitution 154; correlation-research 99; disclosure 155; epoché 223, 246, 252; experience 164, 186, 218, 221, 231f., 234; focus 223; grounding of the factual sciences 100; interpretation of history 100; intuition 246; living 16; method 291; ontology 100, 421; phen. 95, 117, 120; philosophy 178; philosophy and empirical psych. 209;
phenomenological psychology 46-49, 54, 57, 60, 66, 92, 117, 134, 161, 165, 170, 174, 183-188, 200, 202, 210, 213f., 228, 230, 233-236, 238, 242, 248, 250; as descriptive 114; as eidetic science 67; of reason 235; essential function of 232; history of 94

phenomenologically pure psych. 122, 126, 166, 169, 174
phenomenological reduction, the 30, 47, 66, 87f., 90f., 93, 97, 113f. 126, 128, 163, 174, 184, 186, 205, 222f., 241f., 246, 252, 491f., 495; lack of in Brentano 121
phenomenological reflection 90f.; resolution of phil. antitheses 193; science of consciousness 149; solution to phil. antitheses 206; turn of gaze 110;
phenomenological-psychological reduction 66f., 112, 126, 171, 246; research 229
phenomenology: a priori 166, 230; and psych. 211; as a breakthrough in philosophizing 476; as a traditional ontology 326; as all-embracing absolute science 253; definition of 426; the enterprise of 47, 55; H.'s concept of 295, 297; of emotional and volitional life 100; of empathy 115; of intersubjectivity 252; pure universal 234
phenomenon 311; definition of 292ff.; phen. concept of 294
philosophical anthropology 287, 336, 429f. 455ff., 485; as not a ground for phil. 486f.; Kant's idea of a 454
phil. antitheses, phen. resolution of 178
philosophical phenomenology 100f., 149
philosophizing, authentic 463
philosophy: a universal science of the world 490f.; and positive science 500; as leaping forth in the soul 477; as rigorous science 426; as transformation of same questions 477; as universal phen. ontology 421; Greek origins of 487; Hu's and H.'s visions of 425, 429-433; of life 485; self-understanding of 476; strives for absolute truths 487; transcendental turn only path to a radically grounded phil. 498
physiologoi 459
place of man in the cosmos 456
Plato 12, 108, 148, 193, 270, 275, 429, 439, 477
Pöggeler, Otto 425
Pos 200
positivism 101; and metaphysics 178
positivity 129, 209; and transcendentality 121, 123
possible being, every 150
possible facts of a possible world 128
possible worlds 128, 241, 243; every 150
practical concern 397; the temporality of 394
practical insight 331, 398
preconceptual comprehension of Being 463f.; Hu objects to 431
pregiven world 238, 242, 244, 252, 287, 397, 431; Descartes regresses from 488; must be bracketed 492; see also world
pregivenness of things in the world 460
prejudice 439
preontological, the 282
present, the authentic 387
presuppositions, H. and 375f.
primordial finitude 470
problematic of finitude 471
problematics of the transcendental sphere 498
production of meaning 248
Protestantism, H.'s 9
psych.-phen. constitution of the world 500
psychic life-process 170f.; subjectivity 126, 191; whole 116
psychical, the 160
psychognosia 214
psychological attitude in positivity 129;
psychological ego 132; pure p. e. 52
psychological inner experience 246
psychological phenomenology 45, 83ff., 95, 149, 173, 213f., 235, 242, 244, 252f.
psychological positivity 253
psychological reduction 172, 191, 222, 246
psychological subjectivity 250
psychological-phenomenological reduction 96, 128, 173, 235, 247
psychologism 67, 96, 98, 101, 119ff., 126, 133, 167, 169, 188, 206, 209, 234, 237, 241, 249f., 485f.; and anti-psychologism 101, 178, 193, 251; as a false solution 187; circularity of 170; overcoming 168; transcendental 251
psychologists as potential transcendental philosophers 500
psychology 241; affinity with philosophy 500; as a positive science 109; as a rational science of facts 253; its development in modern times 499f.; of inner experience, Locke's 237; pure 45; reformation of 500
psychology of reason 235
public time 417
pure community, possible 132
pure: consciousness 143f.; Ego 143f.; eidetic phen. 251; eidetic psych. 92, 210; eidetic structures 204; horizon 446; ideal worlds 169; inner experience 253; intersubjectivity 93f.; life-process of the ego 225; mental experience 215; natural science 158, 214, 488; phen. experience 219ff.; phen. psychology 67, 165, 167f., 172, 213, 233, 235; phen. subjectivity 246; psych. genesis, explored by Locke 118; universal phenomenology 234
pure psychology 49, 54, 60, 66f., 83, 86, 88, 90, 94, 97, 109f., 112, 117, 126f., 134, 136-139, 148f., 155, 160, 174, 183, 188, 207, 209ff., 214ff., 218, 249; as one-sided 143; as phen. psychology 92; as propaedeutic to transcendental phen. 133; as reductive-eidetic 114; the basic function of 115f.; early development of 121; need for 87; of eidetic cognition 123; of knowledge 119; systematic development of a 123; transcendental naiveté of 130
pure: psyches 172; psychic phenomena 127; psychic, a priori structures of the 116; science of nature 160; self-affection 449; subject 129; subjectivity 96f., 109, 129; transcendental

philosophy 252; universals 230
purely mental, the 160, 163, 184, 216, 221
purely psychological phenomenology 94, 98
purely transcendental science 252
purity, concept of 218

question of being 275, 459, 462; and authentic philosophizing 463; as such, the 465; ontological priority of 278
questioning as a mode of being 278

radical self-justification 177
radically grounded phil. and trans. turn 498
ratio of the world 487
rational insight 494; science of 500; ideal of phil. 488
rationalism and empiricism 101, 178f., 193
realism 101; H. on 351; problem of 237
reality: as an ontological problem 351; meaning of 353f.
reason, finitude of 441; problematic of 117; structural system of 242
reduction: means of access to the new realm 493. to pure subjectivity, Descartes' method 118; psychological 172, 191; psych.-phen. 247; transcendental 172, 190f.; transcendental-phenomenological 171; *see also* epoché
reductions, several 235
Rees 10, 13, 14
reference, analysis of 317f.
referential totalities 317
Reinach 103, 105, 195
relationship to H. explained by Hu 479-83
relativism and absolutism 178, 193f.
relativity of all being 495; of every conceivable world 240
religion, phen. of 196
remembering 388
representation 378
res cogitans 108
resolution 361, 369, 372, 410; authentic 371, 409; anticipatory 374; disclosedness and 370
respect 331
retrieval of an inherited possibility 410
reversal of gaze 497
Richardson 211, 426
Richter [the Minister of Education] 137, 139
Rickert 4, 8, 27
right time 387
Rosenberg 201

Salmon 37, 59, 62ff, 66, 71ff., 77, 103, 182, 195, 206
Schapp 104
Scheler 103ff., 141, 195f., 302, 455, 499; his phil. anthropology 430
Schelling 141
Schreier 105
scientific character of phen., H.'s loss of 480
self 111, 115, 496; as individual 112; eksistentiality of 378; Everyone-self vs. authentic 334f.; habituality of 112; in community 112; is time itself 452; ontological structure of 380; the problematic of 379; the transcendental 428; transcendental experience of 247f.; time and finitude in the 428; unintelligibility of the 240
self-affection: idea of 449; time as pure 448, 452
self-apperception 130, 248
self-consciousness 286
self-experience 67, 88f., 160, 162, 164, 184, 185, 221; absolute 128; transcendental 173, 191
self-givenness, evidential 221
self-giving of things/entities 461, 464
self-justification, radical 177
self-reflection 102; all-embracing 177
self-understanding as the manifesting break-in to being 468
selfhood 377; authentic 362, 380; conceived existentially 377; horizon of 451
sense of being 243; of subjectivity 250
sensualism 220
shared fate as being with others 409
Shestov 201
sign 319ff.
significance 320f., 323
signs 317f.
solitude, human and transcendental 491
somatology, one-sided 143
soul-substance, objection 330
spark leaping forth from the fire 477
spatiality 326, 328; to be spatial in a certain way 403f.
spatiotemporality 215
Spiegelberg 65, 68, 203, 206
Spileers 259, 435
spiritualization of nature 157, 215
Spranger 13
starting-point intuition 145
Stavenhagen 105, 196
Stein 14, 26, 27, 105, 195
step back to consciousness 107, 147
structural forms of a possible transcendental subjectivity 248
Stumpf 201
style-form 232
subject: ontological concept of 378f.; the ontologically eksisting Dasein 402
subjective conscious life 96; genesis 189; modes of appearance 127; reflection 431
subjective-transcendental idea of phil. 487
subjectivism and objectivism 101, 178, 193
subjectivity 96ff., 125, 169, 171, 231, 239, 245, 309, 432; absolute 25; all-embracing 248; as such 124; constituting 243; even H. uses the taboo word 456; functioning of 234, 242; H. presupposes 428, 446; its sense of being 250; Kant falls back into 457; of consciousness 168, 190, 237, 488; of the subject 447, 454; originaliter 115; possible 169f. 240; psychological and transcendental 237

substance: ego similar to as for Kant 450, 452
substantiality, paralogism of 451
surrender of method of phen. research 480
syntheses 112, 229; kinds of 225;
synthesis: a priori 440; general law of 166; of identity 496; of meaning in consciousness 228; veritative 426

Taft 436
teleological and causal interp. of the world 178, 193f.
teleological conceptions 101
teleological notion of philosophy 487; problems 193; structure of life 193
teleological-tendential structure 177
temporal horizon, immanent 428
temporality 374, 381f., 393, 402, 406, 416, 421; as ontological meaning of care 373; as "outside-of-itself" 383; Dasein's 421, 384f.; immanent versus objective 220; living 244; of practical concern 394; originally finite 384
temporalizing life of the ego 452f.
thaumazein 487
thematizing 400, 414; Hu's note on 401; of entities presupposes Dasein 402
theoretical activity as praxis 397
theoretical/atheoretical, boundary of 397
theorizing 16; H. on 15
theory 15f.; of knowing, transcendental 250; of knowledge 234; Kant's First Critique not a 425, 440, 469; of reason 235
Thomas Aquinas 285
Thomism 285
thrownness 337, 349, 408; existential meaning of 364; structure of 365
thrownness of ego is not its finitude 444
thumbscrews to consciousness, putting the 497
time: and horizon 417; and the transcendental power of the imagination 453; as pure intuition 448; as pure self-affection 448, 452; as pure, finite intuition 448; becomes public in concern itself 416; Hegel's concept of 421; immanent 451f.; objective 220; ordinary representation has a natural legitimacy 420; ordinary view of 418f.; original 453; original essence of 452; passes and comes 420; phen. description of 429; public 417; temporalizing in world-time 448; the self-constitution of 25
time-character of being 290f.
time-consciousness 26f.
time-determinedness 288
tradition 289, 440
traditional interpretation of Dasein 289
trancendental Ego as "time itself" 429
trancendental problem 240
transcendence 47; finite 426; grounded in the imagination 471; of Dasein 471
transcendens 275
transcendent, the 109
transcendental, the 172, 446; apprehension of the world 287; attitude 123, 496; base-science, a 235; bestowal of meaning 249; circle 129, 169, 188, 244; community of egos 173, 247; concern 134; conditions of knowledge 426; consciousness, the Ego's 492; world inseparable from 492; transcendental constitution 25, 52, 143; constitution of entities 138; dimension of scientific inquiry 488
transcendental Ego 49, 52, 132, 173, 205, 246ff., 432, 491, 492ff., 496f.; as absolute subject 494f.; centrality of 46; not an abstraction from concrete human being 493; time a component in 428
transcendental epoché 172f., 244, 247f.
transcendental experience 132, 177, 190, 246, 250, 252
transcendental field 492; focus 238, 248, 252f.; foundation 248; idealism 98; idealism of phen. 102; inquiry 248
transcendental intersubjectivity 133, 173, 177, 192, 249f., 498
transcendental knowledge 297
transcendental life 173, 177; community of 498
transcendental logic a nonconcept 471
transcendental mode of inquiry 242
transcendental naiveté 244; in pure psychology 130
transcendental phenomena 132
transcendental phenomenology 46, 48f., 57, 60f., 66f., 95, 98ff., 117, 119f., 135, 150, 167, 173ff., 187f., 194, 209f., 213f., 235, 238, 243, 248, 250, 253, 489, 499; as the one definitive phil. 499; constructing a 251; H. gave it up 480; not anthropological 485f.; path of 498; true meaning of 489
transcendental philosophy 45-49, 61, 66, 96ff., 117, 122f., 134, 167, 170, 175f., 187, 211, 238, 244, 251f., 447, 500; apodictically necessary 489; as universal ontology 98; the building of a 250f.; method of 486f.; in Descartes 120; task of 124;
transcendental philosopher 172
transcendental power of the imagination 428
transcendental problem 96, 124, 128, 139, 168, 188, 190, 206, 235, 238, 241f., 251, 496, 499; in relation to *SZ* 136; the genuine 250
transcendental problematic 137, 148; making it palpable 252
transcendental psychologism 119, 251
transcendental psychology in Descartes 120
transcendental purification 132
transcendental question/ing 170f., 243, 244
transcendental realm of consciousness 497
transcendental reduction 46, 49, 52, 54f., 97f., 122, 130, 132f., 135, 172, 174, 190f., 205, 235, 242, 246, 249f., 252, 493f.
transcendental relativity of all being 495
transcendental revolution 252
transcendental science 245; a purely 252; the task of a 492

transcendental self, nature of 428
transcendental semblance 249; of doubling 243
transcendental solipsism, illusion of 498
transcendental solitude 491
transcendental sphere 134; problematics of 498
transcendental spirituality 178; standpoint 253; subjectivism 101
transcendental subjectivity 101, 109, 122, 136, 149, 152, 156, 171f., 175, 190f., 194, 245, 249f., 432, 462, 499; need for systematic study of 496; new grounding for all sciences 486; a source of being 495
transcendental subjects 150; theory of knowing 120, 250; theory of reason 98; turn 167, 498
transcendental-phenomenological reduction 67, 171, 235, 243
transcendentalism 101
transcendentality versus positivity 123
transcendentally disclosed problems of being 498; functioning subjectivity 464; intersubjective nexus 132; pure consciousness 149; pure ego 129, 250
true being 236
true science 179
truth 439; objective 243; being of 356; form of the being of 355; presuppositions of 356

ultimate and highest problems as phenomenological 157, 177
ultimate problems 193
understanding 273, 345, 347, 388; and explication 344; as being-projected 412; as circular 376; as intentionality in disguise 412; authentic and inauthentic 342; discloses 341ff.; the event of 466f.; finitude of 443; Hu on 431; the inner possibility of 464f.; the lure of the ordinary form of 411; meaning requires 350; of being 276, 278, 321, 352, 376, 398, 426, 430, 438, 471; preconceptual 463; problematic of 117; temporality of 386
unintelligibility 169; of entities 139; of H. excludes friendship 482; of self 240
unity of the totality of Nature 215
universal 146; a priori 156; a priori knowledge 487; belief in being 490; eidetics 248; empirical phen. 149; epoché 163, 491; intuition 150; ontology 152, 156, 175, 191f., 488; phen. 156, 158; phen. ontology 421; positive ontology 123; pure phen. 234; rational knowledge of what-is 488; reason 193;
universal science 193, 500; constructing it with absolute foundations 175, 191, 205, 253
universal task, idea of 85
universal validity of egological phen. 232
universal world knowledge 151
universality of phenomenology 157; of the phen. epoché 223; of world 239
universals, pure 230
unshakable joy 374
Urhabitus 16
useful, practical concern with the 397
usefulness, ontological structure of 321

validity: critique of 345; of being 176, 239
value-theory 15
Van Breda 69
Van Buren 3
variation on Hu, a 385
veritative synthesis 426
violence in interpretation 429, 453
visions of phil., Hu's and H.'s 429-432
Volkelt 13

wholeness of the human being 138
willing and wishing 350
within-time-ness 384
Wolff 150f.
world 15, 86, 94, 119, 138, 147, 156, 168, 234f., 239f., 244ff., 287, 307, 311, 317, 320ff., 339, 379, 431; and being 403; and transcendental consciousness 492; a priori of the 153; as transcendental phenomenon 495; can be explored transcendentally 497; concepts of 312f.; its essential occurrence 477; of prescientific experience 487; ontological definition of 323; phen. interrogates 497f.; possible 170f., 246; pregiven 235, 238, 252; psych.-phen. constitution of 500; rendered questionable 127; representation of 495; the transcendence of the 393f.; transcendental relativity of 495; universal structures of 243; universality of 239
world history 411ff.
world-constituting life-process 171, 244
world-historical 408, 412
world-time 417f.
worldhood 311ff., 320ff., 339; of world 354
worldless "I" a bad starting point 377
worldless subject, Hu objects to 402, 412
worldlessness 304f.
worldliness 243
worlds, ideal 125, 240; pure ideal 169
worldview as goal of phil. 454f.

Yorck 415