

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

HUSSERL AND HEIDEGGER:
THE MAKING AND UNMAKING OF A RELATIONSHIP

**HUSSERL AND HEIDEGGER:
The Making and Unmaking of a Relationship**

I. THE EARLY YEARS

Heidegger's initial contacts with Husserl's work: 1909-19

First personal contacts: 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,
and Husserl's first impressions

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

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

HUSSERL AND HEIDEGGER: THE MAKING AND UNMAKING OF A RELATIONSHIP

Thomas Sheehan

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

¹Heidegger/Jaspers *Briefwechsel*, p. 71 (December 26, 1926).

²Heidegger'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 Miemeyer, 1969, pp. 81-90; E.T., "My Way Into Phenomenology" in *On Time and Being*, ed. and trans. John Stambaugh, New York: Harper & Row, 1972. (3) "Nur noch ein Gott kann us 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,

Likewise, the publication of Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe*, beginning in 1976, has made 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 is 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 1918) 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

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 Gehrige, 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.

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

⁴Edmund Husserl, *Briefwechsel*, 10 volumes, ed. Karl Schuhmann 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.

⁵Kisiel, *Genesis of Being and Time*, 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 Taminiaux, eds., *The*

I. THE EARLY YEARS

HEIDEGGER'S INITIAL CONTACTS WITH HUSSERL'S WORK: 1909-19

On 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, $\pi\rho\text{-}\zeta\text{-}\nu$ referral⁶ of the multiple meanings of the participle-turned-noun $_v$ (a being, an entity, whatever-is) or, equally, of the various ways that the verb $_v\alpha\iota$ (to be) or the noun $\omicron\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\alpha$ (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, 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

Collegium Phaenomenologicum, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988, pp. 77-137.

⁶Cf. for example, Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, *K*, 3, 1061 a 11.

⁷Franz 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.

⁸Edmund 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.

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 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

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

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

¹¹Husserl'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.

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

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

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*, I/1, *Frühe Schriften*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1978., pp. 59-188.

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.

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 was 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, 1916¹⁹

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

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

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).

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

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 cordially greetings,

Yours,
E Husserl²¹

Husserl nonetheless helped Heidegger get the work published that year, presumably by intervening with the Wissenschaftliches 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 well as I am able. On October 4 I begin my lecture course on logic, an effort to bring

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.

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.

my work on the problem of time to some kind of conclusion.
With cordial greetings to you and your wife,
Yours truly,
E Husserl²⁵

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 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

²⁵ *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 128.

²⁶ *Briefwechsel* V, p. 131-2.

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: HarperCollins, 1993, p. 115. Husserl's denunciation was made during a meeting of philosophy faculty meeting in late

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

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 earlier³²) and that between June 1916 and March 1917 Heidegger had undergone a crisis of faith that culminated in his virtual

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. Elfride Heidegger, February 19, 1924).

³⁰Ott, *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 (Elfride Petri), who, he says, "as far as I know, has not converted [to Catholicism] up to this point."

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

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

THE BOND IS FORGED: 1918

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. Elfide 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.

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 possesses 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 συμ_ιλοσο_ν. 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

Two months later Husserl answered another letter from Heidegger:

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

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 συμ_ιλοσο_ν ["philosophizing together"] is an allusion to the passage in Aristotle's remark on friendship in *Nicomachean Ethics*, IX, 12, 1172 a 4-7: ἄλλοι δ_...συμ_ιλοσο_ο_σιν , _αστοι_ν_ το_τ_ συνημ_ρ_οντ_ς_ τ_ π_ρ_ μ_λιστα_ γαπ'σι τ'ν_ν_ τ_ β_.... ("[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.

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 while³⁸ is very good. Hopefully, after the glorious victories in the West³⁸ the war will not drag on too much longer, and afterwards you can return with even greater vigor to the difficult problems your raise, and I will gladly do my part to bring you *in medias res* and to familiarize you with those *res* in **συμ_ίλοσο**___v.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 Husserl⁴⁰

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 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

³⁸On 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.

³⁹The Latin phrase is from Horace, *Epistularum 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.

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 I₂ 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 [would be the case], 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 Husserl⁴³

In early July Heidegger was transferred 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 (War-front Meteorology Corps 414), was transferred to the war-front a few miles 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

⁴¹Two 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.

⁴²Husserl 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.

that expresses his personal feelings towards the young scholar-soldier.⁴⁴

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 him⁴⁵ 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).

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

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

⁴⁶Heidegger 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.

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 you⁴⁷ how heavily the recent events of the war weigh upon our spirits. Yet it will certainly turn out for the 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 reaction. 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 yet⁴⁹ know too little, and so you and I will be in touch, reading him.

Best wishes to you.

Yours,

E Husserl⁵⁰

"PHILOSOPHICAL SOULMATES": THE FIRST FREIBURG PERIOD: 1919-1923⁵¹

The war over, Heidegger returned to Freiburg by early December of

⁴⁷The 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 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], threatens 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."

⁴⁸Heidegger 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.

⁴⁹Years 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: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993, p. 145.

⁵⁰*Briefwechsel IV*, pp. 135-6.

⁵¹I 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....*"

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 very beginning, the radical differences between the 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

⁵²Information from the late Mrs. Elfride 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 brackets 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 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.

⁵⁵Heidegger 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.

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 cannot live."⁵⁷ "In theoretical acts I leave my lived experience behind. To be sure, something that is still experientiable 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 experience⁵⁸) from the ravages of theorizing, Heidegger in this course radically reinterprets the "principle of all principles" that

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

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 75, 78, 112; cf. p. 205.

⁵⁸Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 207 and 211.

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 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 Heidegger's 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 to the *Logical Investigations*, I am now convinced that Husserl was never a philosopher, not⁶¹ even for one second in his life. He becomes ever more ludicrous.

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

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.

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 trivialities that would make you weep. He lives off his mission as the "Founder⁶³ of Phenomenology," but nobody knows what that means.

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

II. THE PARTING OF THE WAYS⁶⁴

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 Being and Time* and in shorter form in his article "Husserl and Heidegger."⁶⁵ With only passing reference to some of the criticisms,⁶⁶ we now turn to the other end of the relation between Husserl and

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

⁶⁵Theodore Kisiel, "Husserl and Heidegger" in *Encyclopaedia of Phenomenology*, ed. Lester Embree (*biographical data).

⁶⁶A 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, 1927, 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 $\nu\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma$ 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.

Heidegger, the parting of the ways.

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.

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

⁶⁷Cf. note 5 above.

⁶⁸Writing 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.

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 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.)
...δ_λον γ_ _ς μ_ς μ_ν τα_τα (τ_ ποτ_ βο_λ_σ'_ _σημα_v_iv

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; ET "My Way to Phenomenology" in *On Time and Being*, pp. 74-82; here p. 80.

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 fertige]." 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.xxiv.

π_ταν_ν_γ_η_σ_) π_λαι_γ_ιν_ι_σ_τ_, μ_ς_δ_π_το_μ_ν
μ_α, ν_ν_δ'_πο_α_μ_ν.

"...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*.

The Publication of Sein und Zeit, April 1927, and Husserl's First Impressions

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

⁷²For further details on this dedication page, and the changes that would be made in it in the published version, see below, "Editor's Foreword to Husserl's Marginal Notes in *Sein und Zeit*."

⁷³See 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) Theodore Kisiel 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, Halle a.d. Saale, Niemeyer 1927 (format:

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:

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

April 8, 1927.

Lessing

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

23 x 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." Edmund Husserl, *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 140 (April 5, 1927, to Heidegger).

⁷⁸ Cf. *Briefwechsel* III, p. 347 (April 20, 1926, to Fritz Kaufmann).

style of thinking" and its "exception, 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 to Heidegger's opposition. For some years he had been hearing rumors that Heidegger was not just taking a different approach to 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

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).

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

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 embedded in "factual Dasein." In a letter written to Husserl two days after the visit, Heidegger made a brief effort "to characterize the fundamental orientation of

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 an continuation and improvement of my own!"

⁸⁴ *Briefwechsel* III, p. 456.

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, as regards 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 until 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 his⁸⁶ own way of doing things when he began studying my writings.

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

⁸⁵ "...die grundsätzliche Tendenz von 'Sein und Zeit' innerhalb des transzendental Problems zu kennzeichnen": Heidegger's letter to Husserl, October 22, 1927, *Hu* IX, 600; ET in Part One, B., 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).

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 explanation 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 Todtnauberg⁸⁸ (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 to you 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 factual Dasein "harbors within itself the possibility of transcendental constitution."⁹⁰ All

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 transzendenten Konstitution birgt"; cf. p. 602: "daß die Existenzverfassung des Daseins die transzendentale Konstitution alles Positiven ermöglicht"); ET in Part One, B., 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:

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

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 1940's through the 1960's 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 of 1928.

"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).

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

⁹²See 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 proposito que mostrar las diferentes concepciones que había entre su maestro y la suya." See also the editor's introduction to Husserl, *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins* pp. xxiii-xxiv, esp. xxiii, n. 1.

⁹³See 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 ET: 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 ET supplants the earlier one by James S. Churchill, *The Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

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) 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

⁹⁴The 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 Koepfel, *Collected Works*, ed. by L. Gelber and Romaeus Leuven, vol. 5, Washington, D.C.: Institute of Carmelite Studies, 1993, pp. 18-21.

⁹⁵On 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* p. 90-1 (February 25 and March 6, 1928, Heidegger to Jaspers); Husserl *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 152 (March 5, 1928, to Heidegger), and our introduction to the EB Article, below.

⁹⁶Ironically, 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).

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 his dissatisfaction with "Heidegger's insufficient introduction" -- even though Husserl had earlier told Heidegger that the introduction was

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 Lösungswort, 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 ET 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).

"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 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 intense intellectual exchange and stable 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

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 uberreicht / 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), ET in Appendix below.

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

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 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. (It was his second time through *Sein und Zeit*.) As he wrote to Pfänder: "Immediately after the printing of my last book [*Formale und transzendente 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 time¹⁰⁷ 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

¹⁰⁵ In Appendix I below.

¹⁰⁶ *Briefwechsel* II, p. 184 (January 6, 1931, to Pfänder). Husserl sent off the last corrections to *Formale und transzendente 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.

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 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 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: "Plato amicus, magis amica veritas."¹¹²

DÉNOUEMENT: 1929 TO 1931, AND BEYOND

Upon returning from Tremezzo to Freiburg (early September 1929), Husserl

¹⁰⁸The 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).

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

¹¹²"Plato is my friend, but a greater friend is truth." See further "Editor's Foreword to Husserl's Marginal Notes in *Sein und Zeit*," Part Three, A., below..

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

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; ET "Author's Preface to the English Edition," in Edmund Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, translated by W. R. Boyce Gibson, New York: Macmillan, 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.* Get German page

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*, 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

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.

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 eigeklammert," *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.

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-Semitism¹²⁶ and eventually his public adherence to 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

End

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.

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 pagre, 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.