

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

Introduction

Draft A (September, 1927)

The outline of Draft A
Getting Heidegger involved
Various schedules for meeting at Husserl's home

Draft B (October 10-22, 1927)

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

From Draft B to Draft C (late October 1927)

The dialogue of the deaf
What Draft B accomplished

Draft C (after October 23, 1927)

The dating of Draft C
The title of Draft C
The Introduction to Draft C

Draft D (November 1927)

The dating of Draft D
The writing of Draft D

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

Christopher V. Salmon
A chronology of Draft E

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

The structures of Drafts E and F
The lifespan of Draft F: 1929-1956

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

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



THE CATALOGED ORDER OF "M III 10" IN THE HUSSERL ARCHIVES

I

I	1	carbon copy [D1]	pp.	1a, 1b, 10-11, 11a, 11b 12-29, 29b, 30-1	FOURTH DRAFT [D]
	2	carbon copy [D2]	pp.	1, 2, 5-15, 17, 24-29	

II

II	1	Salmon's <u>second</u> draft) typed original [E2a]	pp.	1-13; 17-9; 21-2; i-ii and 1-2 ¹	SALMON'S ABRIDGED TRANSLATION 2 Salmon's <u>first</u> draft pp.1-22 + i-ii and 1-2 ² [E]
		carbon copy ³ [E1b]			

III

	1	second carbon: [A1]	pp.	1-23, plus 5a and 7a (p. 24-25 are found in E1b)	FIRST DRAFT
			2	first carbon: ⁴ pp. [A] (p. 25 = missing)	
		typed original: [B1]	i. ii-a	pp. 1-11 pp. 12-14 <1-3> -- -- missing iii pp. 21-28	
	3	first carbon: [B2]	i. ii-a ii-b iii	pp. 1-11 pp. 12-14 <1-3> pp. 15-20 <4-9> pp. 21-28 <10-17>	SECOND DRAFT [B]

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

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

³The original is lost.

⁴The original is lost.

	second carbon: [B3]	--	--	-- non-existent	
		--	--	-- non-existent	
			--	-- non-existent	
		iii	pp.	21-28	
4	carbon copy: [C2]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1-13, plus 8a; 13a,b; 14-18, 20, 22-25, 28-42, 43 (second half), 44-45.	
5	carbon copy: [C3]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1-13, plus 8a; 13a,b; 14-45	THIRD DRAFT [C]
6	typed original [C1]		pp.	1a,b,c,d; 1-2,5-13, plus 8a; 15-18, 20, 22-25, 28-30, 43 (first half)	

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

Thomas Sheehan

Husserl's writing and redacting of the EB Article extended from early September 1927 through at least February of 1928. The present introduction, in the form of a *Redaktionsgeschichte*, focuses on the development of the drafts of the Article, and particularly the first and second drafts. The pioneering editorial work of Professor Walter Biemel, published in *Hu IX*, is the indispensable foundation for what follows.⁵ To his work we have added our own close study of the available manuscripts in the light of other materials, and we place this research in the appendix following this introduction. It is indispensable for understanding the intricate and often puzzling questions pertaining to the chronology of drafts of the Article.

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

It is not known exactly when 1927 James Louis Garvin, British editor of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, contacted Husserl with an invitation to write the entry "Phenomenology" for the new, fourteenth edition.⁶ No relevant letter has been found in Husserl's papers, and in 1993 the Editorial Offices of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.* reported that the company's correspondence with Husserl was destroyed after the edition appeared. We do know that in April of 1927 Garvin set September of 1929 as the target date for publication the new *Britannica* (that goal was, in fact, met) and that sometime after February of 1928 the final English version of Husserl's Article was completed by Christopher V. Salmon. The first recorded mention of the EB Article comes on September 30, 1927, in Husserl's letter to his friend Paul Jensen of Göttingen:⁷

...I have had to work hard, and perhaps a bit too much, during this vacation period, in the last instance on another article, entitled "Phenomenology," for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. It also proved to be quite difficult since I was held to a very restricted length (equal to about twelve pages of the *Jahrbuch*). But it finally turned out to my satisfaction.⁸

⁶The *thirteen* edition of the *Britannica* had appeared in 1926, but, like the twelfth edition of 1922, it consisted only of supplements (even if extraordinary ones -- by Trotsky and Einstein, for example) to the famous eleventh edition brought out by Hugh Chisholm in 1911. The *fourteenth* edition would remain in print (with revisions) from 1929 until 1974. The *fifteenth* edition (1974 to the present; designed by Mortimer Adler) carries a new sub-title -- "The New *Encyclopaedia Britannica*" -- which replaced the subtitle that had been used from 1768 through 1973: "A New Survey of Universal Knowledge." Beginning in 1928 the *Britannica* was owned by Sears, Roebuck Co., which was the company that paid Husserl for his Article. The fourteen edition of the encyclopaedia was printed in Chicago and was published in September 1929 (just weeks before the New York Stock Market crashed) at an estimated cost of \$2.5 million. See Eugene P. Sheehy, ed., *Guide to Reference Books*, 10th ed., Chicago: American Library Association, 1986, pp. 134-135; and Herman Kogan, *The Great EB*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958, chapters 17 and 18.

⁷The first edition of Karl Schuhmann's *Husserl-Chronik*, p. 320, incorrectly indicates that Husserl's earliest mention of the Article dates to a letter of "3.II.27" (i.e., February 3, 1927) written to Gustav Albrecht. I am grateful to Prof. Karl Schuhmann for clarifying (in his letter of August 12, 1994) that "3.II.27," is a misprint for "13.XI.27."

⁸*Briefwechsel* IX, p. 306. A *Jahrbuch* page averaged about 360 words; hence the article was limited to around 4000 words. Salmon's condensed translation comes to 3844 words without bibliography, 4017 with bibliography.

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

DRAFT A (SEPTEMBER 1927)

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

Not long after September 15 Husserl had Ludwig Landgrebe, his research assistant at Freiburg University, type out this shorthand manuscript into twenty-five double-spaced pages, with two carbon

⁹On the vacation in Switzerland: *Briefwechsel VIII*, p. 39, n. 2, correcting Husserl, *Briefe an Ingarden*, p. 152.

copies.¹⁰ After studying the typed version, Husserl added two more pages, numbered as "5a" and 7a," for a total of twenty-seven pages. This original typescript of the shorthand version of Draft A has since been lost. We call it Draft A00. However, the two carbon copies have survived, and we refer to them as Draft A1 and Draft A2.¹¹

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

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

¹¹¹On p. 1 of Draft A2 Husserl writes in pencil: "Erste Entwurf 1-21" ("First Draft, [pp.] 1-21"). However, A00 was made up of twenty-five pages, numbered 1-25, with two inserted pages numbered "5a" and "7a."

DRAFT A
GENERAL OUTLINE OF MAIN TOPICS

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

Getting Heidegger involved: In September of 1927 Heidegger was at his cabin in Todtnauberg, near Freiburg, where he and his family had been vacationing since mid-summer. Before Husserl left for his vacation in Switzerland (September 1), he asked Heidegger for three things: (1) that Heidegger read and comment on the EB Article when it would be finished; (2) that he read and comment on a second typed manuscript, entitled "Studien zur Struktur des Bewußtseins" ("Studies on the Structure of Consciousness"), which likewise dealt with pure phenomenological psychology; and (3) that Heidegger visit Husserl in Freiburg, beginning on October 10, in order to discuss these two texts.

In early September Heidegger set aside his own work¹² in order to begin reading the "Studies on the Structure of Consciousness." The manuscript, which Husserl had been working on since 1926, consisted of three interrelated studies: "Activity and Passivity," "Value-Constitution, Mind, Will," and "Modalities and Tendencies." The manuscript that Heidegger read represented Husserl's second draft of the project.¹³

After returning from vacation (September 15), Husserl had Landgrebe type up his shorthand Draft A0. Then, no doubt impressing upon Heidegger the urgency of the task,¹⁴ he sent the second carbon copy of the Article to Heidegger in Todtnauberg for his critical comments, while keeping A2 and the now-lost typed original, A00, with himself in Freiburg. Hence, we may designate A1 as the "Todtnauberg copy" of the Article and A2 as the "Freiburg copy."

¹²Heidegger had been rereading Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* in preparation for his autumn lecture course, "Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft." The course, edited by Ingrid Görland, has been published under that same title in *Gesamtausgabe* II/25, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977.

¹³In his letter of October 22, 1927 from Messkirch, Heidegger mentions having read yet a second time ("Ich habe ihn jetzt noch einmal durchgelesen") "the three sections of the manuscript that Landgrebe typed" ("den drei Abschnitten des von Landgrebe getippten Ms."), and he refers to these texts as "the second draft for the 'Studien'" ("den zweiten Entwurf für die 'Studien'"). Heidegger adjudges the text to contain "the essential elements" of "a pure psychology" ("reine Psychologie...die wesentlichen Stücke") and urges Husserl to publish this research (*Hu* IX, p. 601; ET in Appendices to Draft B, *infra*). The typescript of this manuscript, kept at the Husserl Archives under the signature M III 3, is in three parts: I. Aktivität und Passivität; II. Wertkonstitution, Gemüt, Wille; and III. Modalitäten und Tendenz.

¹⁴Cf. Heidegger's letter to Husserl, October 22, 1927: "Diesmal stand alles unter dem Druck einer dringenden und wichtigen Aufgabe." *Hu* IX, p. 600.

Various schedules for meeting at Husserl's home: By September 27 Heidegger had settled on his end-of-vacation plans. He would depart Todtnauberg (leaving his wife and two children there) on October 10, visit Husserl for two days, then visit with his brother Fritz in Messkirch. Finally he would go on to visit Karl Jaspers for a week in Heidelberg before returning to Marburg to begin teaching.¹⁵ These plans would change three times over the next three weeks, each time, it seems, because Husserl requested a longer visit in order to work together redacting the EB Article. Heidegger's first program for traveling from Todtnauberg to Marburg was roughly as follows:¹⁶

Original plan (September 27, 1927)	
October 10-11:	visit with Husserl (Monday and Tuesday)
October 12-16:	visit with his brother Fritz in Messkirch
October 16-24:	stay with Jaspers in Heidelberg
October 24:	return to Marburg.

In late September and/or early October Heidegger read Draft A1 of the EB Article, at least up through page 17, where his last marginal note appears. The comments that he wrote into Draft A1 were quite minimal, mostly minor corrections to the text and rephrasings of Husserl's prose. They were hardly substantial and, as far as they went, certainly not controversial. Heidegger had also read the "Studien";

¹⁵A major motive for Heidegger's trip to Messkirch was to visit the grave of his mother, who had died in his absence five months earlier. See Heidegger's letter to Dietrich Mahnke, October 21, 1927: Ms. 862 (Nachlaß Mahnke) der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg: "Da ich hier in meiner Heimat nach das Grab einer in diesem Sommer verstorbenen Mutter besuchen will...." Also Heidegger's remarks to Jaspers in their *Briefwechsel*, p. 79 (September 27, 1927). That this visit was part of the original plan can be deduced from Heidegger/Jaspers *Briefwechsel*, p. 82 (October 19, 1927): "Ich fahre *erst heute* nach meiner Heimat..." emphasis added.

¹⁶Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, pp. 79 (September 27, 1927). "Heute möchte ich nur fragen, ob Sie bzw. Ihre Frau mich als Gast brauchen können nach dem 15. Oktober." That the stay with Jaspers was planned to last something like eight days is presumed from *ibid.*, p. 81 (October 6, 1927).

and sometime before October 6 he communicated his evaluation of that latter text (and maybe of the EB Article as well) in a letter to Husserl, which is now lost.¹⁷

It seems that once Husserl had read Heidegger's letter he requested a longer visit with Heidegger than had been planned, no doubt to discuss the issues raised by the two texts and especially by Draft A of the Article. He asked that Heidegger plan to extend his scheduled stay from two days to a *week*. Heidegger agreed and changed his schedule accordingly. On October 6 he wrote to Jaspers that he could not come to Heidelberg by October 15, as at first planned, but only around October 20.¹⁸ Thus, Heidegger's new end-of-vacation plans looked like this:

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

Heidegger began his visit with Husserl on October 10; but after they had worked together on the Article for a few days, Heidegger's plans changed yet again. The working visit was now extended from six to *ten days*, surely at Husserl's request. This constitutes Heidegger's *third* end-of-vacation schedule. And so on October 19 -- ten days into the visit -- Heidegger wrote Jaspers to say that only

¹⁷On our hypothesis, this now lost letter is the one that Heidegger refers to in his letter to Husserl dated October 22, 1927: "[Ich] halte mein Urteil im vorigen Brief aufrecht." I date that letter before October 6, 1927 on the hypothesis that this letter (and the "Urteil" that Heidegger expressed in it) led to Husserl's new request that Heidegger extend his visit beyond just two days (see below).

¹⁸Heidegger/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel*, p. 81 (October 6, 1927): "Ich komme erst um den 20. Oktober herum und möchte dann, wenn es Ihnen recht is, acht Tage bleiben."

today ("erst heute") was he about to leave for Messkirch. This meant that his trip to Heidelberg could not happen before October 23 or 24.

And yet even after writing that to Jaspers, Heidegger stayed with Husserl *yet one more day*, for a total of *eleven* days of work on the EB Article. He would not leave Freiburg for Messkirch until Thursday, October 20th.¹⁹ Husserl and Heidegger's visit in Freiburg led to a new draft of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article. It also spelled the beginning of the end of their professional relationship. In any case, Heidegger's fourth and final schedule turned out to be as follows:

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

¹⁹On Friday, October 21, 1927, Heidegger wrote to Dietrich Mahnke from Messkirch: "Durch eine gemeinsamer Arbeit mit Husserl (Artikel über Phänomenologie für die Encycl. Britannica) war ich bis gestern in Freiburg festgehalten." Ms. 862 (Nachlaß Mahnke) der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg.

²⁰On Wednesday, October 12, Husserl had a social evening at his house for the Oskar Beckers, Heidegger, Paul Hoffman, Erik Honecker, the Fritz Kaufmanns, Ludwig Langrebe, and from Japan Baron Shûzô Kuki and his wife. See Schuhmann, *Husserl-Chronik*, p. 325, and Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, p. 157, where Ingarden wrongly reports that "Heidegger had merely come from Marburg for a short visit."

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

DRAFT B
(OCTOBER 10-22, 1927)

The manuscript of the second draft of the EB Article is made up of four new Sections, all of them distinct with regard to Draft A.²² The first Section was composed by Heidegger and the last three by Husserl. The material of the second and third Sections is closely related and represents Husserl's attempt to unite the "historical" material of Draft A under one heading. One of our goals is to discern the order in which these Sections were written. The following shows the relations between the four Sections and the corresponding pagination in *Hu IX*:

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

Draft B, Section ii-a (before October 10): On September 30 Husserl had told Paul Jensen that Draft A had "turned out to my satisfaction."²³ However, even before Heidegger's arrival, the shortcomings of Draft A had become clear to Husserl. To begin with, the treatment of the history of phenomenology (topic number 2, above) is awkwardly spread over the Parts I and II of the draft and is

²²We capitalize the word "Sections" in order to indicate the crucial role these divisions of the text play in the articulation of Draft B. Biemel refers to them as "groups" ("Gruppe"). He distinguishes only three of them (*Hu IX*, p. 591), thereby underplaying the break at the top of B p. 15 (= *Hu IX*, p. 266.15) that leads us to divide Section ii into "a" and "b."

²³*Briefwechsel IX*, p. 306; see above.

somewhat ragged at best. For example, Part I, §6 discusses the pre-history of psychological phenomenology, whereas Part II § 1 deals with the historical transition to transcendental phenomenology, but the distinction between the two is not made cleanly. Likewise: Part I §6 discusses Locke but not Descartes; Part II, §1 starts with Descartes, but takes up Locke yet again, and progresses through Brentano's quasi-psychologism to Husserl's transcendental phenomenology. Hardly a neatly organized treatment.

This is why, in late September or early October (in any case, before October 10, when Heidegger arrived in Freiburg), Husserl took to rewriting the second of the three central topics listed above: the question of the historical intertwining of pure psychology and transcendental philosophy and the need to distinguish between the two. Landgrebe typed out the initial results of this new text into three double-spaced pages, with one carbon copy, and he typed page-numbers at the top right-hand corner: 1-3.²⁴ (This page-numbering will become quite important for determining how the writing of Draft B evolved.) These three pages, intended as a revision of Draft A, in fact turned out to be the first pages to be written of Draft B. They correspond to *Hu* IX, pp. 264.1-266.15, that is, to what we shall call Section ii-a of that new draft.²⁵ Here and throughout the second draft, the original typescript pages are called B1, and the single carbon copy is called B2.

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

²⁵The title that Husserl gives to Draft B2 (the only complete copy of Draft B to survive) is "*Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The attempt at a second elaboration (during Heidegger's stay), pp. 15-28, plus Heidegger's pp. 1-10." ("Encycl Brit Zum Versuch der zweiten Bearbeitung (während Heid. Anwesenheit) und Heid. 1-10": in Husserl's shorthand on a cover sheet preceding the text of B2. *Hu* IX, p. 597 (and in part, p. 590).) The last phrase, "1-10") is a mistake for "1-11." The "second elaboration" does not include the three pages that come between 1-11 and 15-28 -- because they were the three pages drafted before Heidegger's visit.

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

the extent to which your emphasis on pure psychology provides the basis for clarifying - or unfolding for the first time with complete exactness -- the question of transcendental subjectivity and its relation to the pure psychic. My disadvantage, to be sure, is that I do not know your concrete investigations of the last few years.²⁶

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

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

(2) Connected with the general problem of the transcendental ego was the specific problem of

²⁶Letter of October 22, 1927. Compare Heidegger's admission in the classroom on February 7, 1925: "I am not sufficiently conversant with the contents of the present stance of his investigations." *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, p. 168; E.T., *History of the Concept of Time*, p. 121.

Draft A's severely underdeveloped treatment of the transcendental reduction to the field of transcendental constitution (topic 3 above). Indeed, Draft A spent much more time addressing topics in transcendental philosophy (its role in generating a universal phenomenological ontology, in overcoming the foundational crises in the sciences, and in overcoming traditional antitheses) than it did on how one might get access to the field of transcendental experience and constitution. For example, in Draft A Husserl touches directly and focally on the transcendental reduction and the transcendental ego in a mere thirty-three lines, whereas he devotes 166 lines (five pages) to his sketch of transcendental philosophy.²⁷

(3) Likewise there was the problem that, apart from the barest of allusions, Draft A made no attempt to articulate how phenomenological psychology might concretely serve as a propaedeutic to transcendental phenomenology. The most the draft had said in that regard was that "one science turns into the other through a mere change in focus, such that the 'same' phenomena and eidetic insights occur in both sciences, albeit under a different rubric...."²⁸

(4) Finally a major issue for Heidegger was the Article's inadequate contextualization of the entire enterprise of phenomenology -- which Heidegger, unlike Husserl, saw primarily (and merely) as a method for doing fundamental ontology. Connected with this was Heidegger's reinterpretation of phenomenological method, a topic he had addressed on May 4, 1927 in his summer semester course, "Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie."²⁹ Like Husserl, Heidegger saw phenomenological reduction

²⁷The thirty-three lines: *Hu IX*, p. 249.11-19 and 25-34; p. 250.10-16; the 166 lines: *Hu IX*, pp. 250.25--254.38.

²⁸Draft A, Part II, §1: pp. 14.27-15.3; = *Hu IX*, p. 247.31-248.2. And in the next sentences Husserl mentions that, historically, Locke looked upon pure psychology only as "the means to a universal solution of the problem of 'understanding'," i.e., transcendental philosophy.

²⁹For the following see Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, p. 29-32; E.T. p. 21-

as a matter of refocusing attention on the already operative activity of transcendental constitution. However, Heidegger located that constitution not in "consciousness and its noetic-noematic experiences, in which objects are constituted as correlates of consciousness"³⁰ but in the "understanding of being" i.e., the prior, structural ability (indeed, necessity) to take entities only in terms of how they are disclosed.³¹ In Heidegger's account, this prior, structural possibility / necessity *is* first-order "constitution" -- he called it eksistential "transcendence" qua "transcendental." This is what underlies and makes possible *both* the second-order constitutive functions of acts of consciousness *and* the third-order reflective-thematic performances of such things as "transcendental reductions." For Heidegger, the performance of such a reflective-thematic act entails not a "return to consciousness" (a *Zurück-führung* or *re*-duction) so much as a "leading-forward" (*Hin-führung* or *in*-duction: $\uparrow\pi\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma Z$ ³²) of one's gaze towards the eksistentially-transcendentally disclosed form of being that lets the entity be understood *as* this or that. In his 1927 course Heidegger calls such an $\uparrow\pi\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma Z$ the "Sichhinbringen zum Sein," the "Hinführung zum Sein" or simply "die Leitung."³³

There were also other, less important difficulties with Draft A, among them the unevenness of

23. See also the thorough treatment in Burt C. Hopkins, *Intentionality in Husserl and Heidegger: The Problem of the Original Method and Phenomenon of Phenomenology*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1993, Parts Two and Three.

³⁰*Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, p. 29; E.T. p. 21.

³¹Cf. *ibid.*: "...die Rückführung des phänomenologischen Blickes...auf das Verstehen des Seins (Entwerfen [des Seienden] auf die Weise seiner Unverborgtheit)." See Steven Galt Crowell, "Husserl, Heidegger, and Transcendental Philosophy: Another Look at the Encyclopaedia Britannica Article," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 1, 3 (March 1990), 501-518.

³²See Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe* II/9, *Wegmarken*, Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1976, pp. 243-4 and 264, where Heidegger interprets $\uparrow\pi\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma Z$ as it appears in Aristotle's *Physics*, A 2, 185 a 12f. This theme is already present in 1927 in Heidegger's use of *Hinführung* and *Leitung*.

³³Loc. cit., p. 29; E.T., p. 21.

Husserl's treatment of the intertwined histories of phenomenological psychology and transcendental philosophy (topic 2 above). But the aggregate of these problems was serious enough to make Husserl decide to put aside the first text and prepare a new one.

The "second elaboration" of the Article (up to October 20): Having read and annotated each other's copies, Husserl and Heidegger settled on a division of labor for producing a new draft of the EB Article. Heidegger would redo the introduction and the first half of the Article. That is, (1) he would present the ontological contextualization of the entire project by situating phenomenology within his own vision of revitalizing the question of being via an inquiry into the essence of subjectivity; and (2) he would reorganize Part I: the object and method of pure phenomenological psychology, and its function as a foundation for empirical psychology.

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

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

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

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

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

<p>Before October 10: Section ii-a</p> <p>October 10-20: Section ii-b Section iii Section i</p>

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

LANDGREBE'S TYPESCRIPT PUBLISHED VERSION

	Original pagination	Final pagination	Pages in <i>Hu IX</i>
Section i	1-11 typed numbers	1-11 typed numbers	256.1-263.37
Section ii-a	1-3 typed numbers	12-14 hand-numbered	264.1-266.15
Section ii-b	4-9 hand-numbered	15-20 typed numbers	266.16-270.39
Section iii	10-17 hand-numbered	21-28 typed numbers	271.1-277.21

Section ii-b: Before Heidegger had finished drafting Section i, Husserl completed writing Section ii-b and had Landgrebe type up an original (=B1) with only one carbon copy (=B2). Since it

was not yet known how many pages long Heidegger's Section i would be, Landgrebe did not type page numbers in either the original (B1) or in the carbon (B2) of Section ii-b. Instead, to keep the continuity with Section ii-a, which was already typed and numbered as pp. 1-3, the eleven new pages of Section ii-b were hand-numbered as pp. 4-9.³⁴

Section iii: Towards the end of Heidegger's visit -- and still before Heidegger had completed Section i -- Husserl finished Section iii and had Langrebe type it up, this time up with two carbon copies (B2 and B3). The reason for the extra carbon copy was that Heidegger would soon be leaving Freiburg, and not having had time to read and annotate Section iii in Freiburg, he would take B3 with him to Messkirch and work on it there. But again, since Section i was not yet finished and typed, Langrebe did not type page numbers in Section ii-b but instead hand-numbered them as pp. 10-17 to keep continuity with the other two typed Sections.³⁵

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

The final page-numbering of Draft B: Now that the length of Heidegger's Section i was

³⁴The hand-numbering is preserved only in B2. Section ii-b is missing from what remains of B1, and, on our hypothesis, no second carbon (B3) was ever typed up for Sections ii-a and ii-b, only for Sections i and iii, which were typed after Sections ii-a and ii-b.

³⁵As with Section ii-b, this hand-numbering is preserved only in B2.

known to be eleven pages, Landgrebe could systematize the page numbers of the entire draft as follows:

Section i: (B1, B2)	The page numbers were already typed as 1-11.
Section ii-a: (B1, B2)	The already typed page numbers, 1-3, were crossed out and replaced by <u>handwritten</u> page numbers 12, 13, 14. ³⁶
Section ii-b: (B1, B2)	The already <u>handwritten</u> pages numbers, 4-9, were replaced (without being crossed out) by <u>typed</u> page numbers 15-20.
Section iii: (B1, B2, B3)	When the above had been done, page numbers 21-28 were typed onto the pages of this final Section.

Heidegger's work on Section iii (October 20-22): Heidegger left Freiburg for Messkirch by train on Thursday, October 20, taking with him the second carbon (B3) of Section iii -- pp. 21-28 of the collated new draft -- and leaving the rest with Husserl. He also took the three manuscripts of the "Studien zur Struktur des Bewußtseins" to reread over the next few days. While Husserl, in Freiburg, was for the first time reading and marking up Heidegger's newly typed Section i (Husserl worked only on the typed original, B1), Heidegger, in Messkirch, was finding much to comment on and to question in Husserl's Section iii.

The main issue for Heidegger was the status of the transcendental ego in relation to the pure

³⁶The crossing out and renumbering is done in B1, the copy Husserl was going to work on. In B2 (the clean copy) the renumbering begins with p. 4, which becomes type-numbered p. 15.

psychological ego. He wondered whether something like world-as-such was not an essential correlative of the absolute ego and, if so, whether Husserl's transcendental reduction could bracket out every actual and possible world.³⁷ He challenged Husserl's claim that the transcendentially reduced ego could not be the human ego stricte dicta.³⁸ And he argued that the "transcendental reduction" -- the way one gets access to the self of transcendental constitution -- was in fact a concrete and "immanent" possibility of "factual Dasein," analogous to the way that, in *Being and Time*, resoluteness is an existentiell possibility whereby concrete, worldly human beings appropriate their existential structure.³⁹

When it came to writing up the outcome of his reading, Heidegger sought (1) to summarize what he thought were the most important questions still outstanding in Section iii, (2) to characterize how *Being and Time* frames the issue of the transcendental, and (3) to make general suggestions about reorganizing Section iii more concisely around the essential issues. All three topics flow together into the three pages that make up the first two appendices of his October 22 letter.⁴⁰

For Husserl the transcendental constitution of worldly entities is the proper purview of the transcendental ego as "absolute," that is, precisely as not a worldly entity. This entails that transcendental constitution is emphatically not the work of the pure psychological ego qua psychological, for the latter is still a "positive" entity, straightforwardly posited in -- and naively presuming the existence and validity of -- the present-at-hand natural world. For Heidegger, on the other hand, the transcendental constitution of the being and significance of all "positive" present-at-hand entities is carried out by yet

³⁷Heidegger's marginal note at B3 p. 24.22 = *Hu IX*, p. 274.6.

³⁸Marginal note at B3 p. 25.21 = *Hu IX*, p. 275, n.

³⁹B3 p. 25, note at the top margin, = *Hu IX*, p. 275, n.

⁴⁰In the seven pages (21-28) of B3, Section iii, Heidegger marks in red those marginal notes of his to which he returns in Anlage I and Anlage II (the two appendices) of his letter.

another entity "posited" in the world (indeed, "thrown" there), the concrete human being as factual Dasein. Although Dasein is through-and-through worldly, its very being, far from having the form of worldly entities' presence-at-hand, has the radically unique form of eksistence (Existenz), whose "wondersome" privilege it is to be the locus of transcendental constitution. In language that Heidegger uses in *Being and Time* but not here: Dasein is at once ontic (although not present-at-hand) and ontologico-transcendental.

On Saturday, October 22, having made his case as succinctly and pointedly as was feasible, Heidegger packed it all together -- (1) the seven marked-up pages of B3, Section iii, (2) the eight pages of his cover letter and its appendices, and (3) the copy of the "Studien zur Structur des Bewußtseins" that he had taken from Freiburg -- and mailed it all off to Husserl.

FROM DRAFT B TO DRAFT C (LATE OCTOBER 1927)

The dialogue of the deaf. Husserl received Heidegger's packet from Messkirch on or soon after Monday, October 23, and on the returned copy of B3, Section iii, he wrote: "Duplicate copy. The new text [that was prepared] for Heidegger, 21-28, with Heidegger's critical notes."⁴¹ He read Heidegger's cover letter and copied out Appendices I and II in shorthand. In the process, he analytically divided each Appendix into seven sections by simply numbering each sentence or related groups of sentences.⁴²

⁴¹See *Hu* IX, p. 603.

⁴²Husserl's shorthand transcriptions of Appendix I and Appendix II are catalogued in the Husserl Archives as M III 10 III 3 (B3), respectively pp. 7a-7b and p. 9. For a transcription of Appendix I (p. 7a, b) see Heidegger's letter of October 22, 1927, below.

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

Human beings in the world -- belonging to it, each one present-at-hand for the other, the way things are present-at-hand for everyone. But to have these presences-at-hand [Vorhandenheiten], there must be I-subjects who have consciousness of the presences-at-hand, who have an idea of them, knowledge [of them]; [these I-subjects] must have a desiring and willing 'consciousness' and must relate themselves, as conscious subjects, in various ways -- striving, valuing, acting -- to what they are conscious of; must also relate to other people as human beings, as presences-at-hand or realities that are not just here or there and do not simply have real properties of whatever kind, but which, instead, are conscious subjects, etc., as was just mentioned.

However, these various properties are properties of realities in the world. And so too are my properties, I who am a man and come upon myself as precisely that.

Ontology as science of the world and of a possible world in general. The being-structure of the world. Universal structures of the world -- of presences-at-hand. -- The being-structure of subjects and of non-subjects.⁴³

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

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

⁴³(*Hu IX*, p. 603 (=M III 10, III 3 [in B3]), numbered as p. 8 in the Husserl Archives cataloguing of the manuscript.

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

(2) Draft B also gave Part I of the Article the articulation that, in general terms, would perdure through the final draft: phenomenological psychology both in itself (its object and method) and vis-à-vis pure psychology (its function as grounding). Husserl would add to this section and rewrite it, but at the end of the entire process of writing the Article he could tell Heidegger that in Draft D, as regards Part I, "something essential [of Heidegger's suggestions] was retained."⁴⁴

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

⁴⁴*Briefwechsel IV*, p. 149.

OUTLINE OF DRAFT B, PART TWO

Part II: Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology:

A. their difference

the *historical inability* to distinguish between the two (Locke) (=D §6)

the *necessity* of distinguishing the two (the transcendental problem) (=D §7)

the *failure* to distinguish the two (psychologism) (=D §8)

the *proper way* to distinguish between the two (transcendental reduction) (=D §9)

B. their relation

the *positive outcome* of distinguishing between the two (propaedeutic) (=D §10)

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

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

DRAFT C
(OCTOBER 23--?, 1927)

The dating of Draft C. Husserl produced much if not all of the penultimate Draft C in the week between October 23 and 31. The terminus a quo of these dates is calculated from Husserl's receipt of Heidegger's mailing from Freiburg, and the terminus ad quem is deduced from certain remarks of Husserl's Polish colleague Roman Ingarden, who, before departing Freiburg at the end of October, read Draft C at Husserl's home. Ingarden, then thirty-four years old, had received a six-month research grant, two months of which (September 1 to October 31) he spent in Freiburg. But because Husserl was on vacation in Switzerland and did not return to Freiburg until September 15, Ingarden, as he notes in a memoir, "had only six weeks to talk with Husserl."⁴⁵ He writes:

At the time, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article was causing Husserl at great deal of concern. He took the whole business with extraordinary seriousness and wrote a number of drafts. I got the third or fourth version, and Husserl asked me to make critical remarks. I would have shaped such an article in a completely different way than Husserl did. I would have given a reasonably concise but thorough report on the already existing phenomenological researches of Husserl and his co-workers. But Husserl set himself the task of an entirely systematic reflection that lays out the idea of phenomenology by starting from phenomenological psychology. That was what he wanted to do, and I thought it was none of my business to raise objections. [...] We spent two mornings discussing these details, and Husserl was visibly pleased that I really got into the work. He even wrote notes from our discussion directly into his text. But as far as I knew, work on the Article continued for a good deal more time.⁴⁶

⁴⁵Husserl, *Briefe an Roman Ingarden*, "Besuch bei Husserl im Herbst 1927," pp. 152-3. Ingarden mistakenly says Husserl vacationed in the Black Forest: p. 152.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 153. Ingarden continues (pp. 153-4): "Quietly within myself I found it unfortunate that Husserl was spending so much time on the Article. I was convinced that the Article was much too long and that he would have to cut it back it substantially. I also feared that when it came to shortening it and putting it into English, an editor-translator would be chosen who was not up to the matter and that to some degree he might be without resources, since English is not suited to Husserl's subtle conceptual formations (and basically remains so even today)."

Ingarden says he read and discussed "the third or fourth version" (die dritte oder vierte Redaktion) of the EB Article, but it was certainly the third. Draft C was a transitional text between the one that was worked out during Heidegger's visit and the final version that Husserl would send off to England to be translated. At fifty-two full pages, it was the longest of the four versions, and Husserl referred to it as "the large draft" (die größere Fassung).⁴⁷ The final draft, D, is basically a compression of C,⁴⁸ with some pages taken over entirely and others rewritten in shorter form. It is highly unlikely that Husserl composed two drafts by October 31: the 52-page Draft C and the twenty-one new pages that make up Draft D. Thus we conclude that Ingarden read Draft C.

The title of Draft C. The Article as commissioned by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* was to be entitled simply "Phenomenology." Husserl himself had said as much in his first reference to the work, on September 30, 1927.⁴⁹ But with Draft C Husserl for the first and last time gives the Article a descriptive working title: "Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Philosophy."⁵⁰ This title disappears in future drafts of the Article but is carried over into the Amsterdam Lectures. Those two lectures, which Husserl described as a "reworking of the typed draft [written] for the Encyclopaedia Britannica,"⁵¹ are entitled, respectively, "Phenomenological Psychology" and "Transcendental

⁴⁷In shorthand in the top margin of Draft D2, p. 1; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 591-2.

⁴⁸The transitional nature of C with regard to D can be seen in the descriptive rubric that Husserl wrote on the outer cover of the first carbon, C2: "Final draft [sic!] -- Phenomenological Psychology and Transcendental Phenomenology -- *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Last elaboration [sic!]." ("Endfassung -- phänomenologische Psychologie und transzendente Phänomenologie -- Encyclopaedia Britannica. Letzte Ausarbeitung"): *Hu IX*, p. 591 with p. 605.

⁴⁹*Briefwechsel IX*, p. 306. See above.

⁵⁰Husserl writes at the top of C2 (carbon copy): "...phänomenologische Psychologie und transzendente Philosophie..." *Hu IX*, p. 591; cf. p. 605.

⁵¹*Hu IX*, p. 615; cf. pp. 617 and 621.

Phenomenology.⁵²

The Introduction to Draft C. Draft C represents a provisional effort by Husserl to utilize some of the suggestions Heidegger had made. In Draft B Heidegger's "Introduction," entitled "The Idea of Philosophy, and the Step Back to Consciousness," (B1 and B2, pp. 1.1--3.10), attempted to locate the entire project of phenomenology within the traditional problematic of the being of entities. Surprisingly enough, Husserl lifted those three pages out of B and brought them over, with relatively minor changes, into Draft C, where they serve as its "Introduction" (pp. 1, a,b,c,d). We do observe, however, that even as he appropriated Heidegger's Introduction, Husserl toned down the emphasis on the question of being. For example, whereas Heidegger in B asserted that "the guiding philosophical problematic" was "the question of the being of entities" and only in the name of that was the turn to consciousness called for,⁵³ Husserl in C claims only that the "fundamental relatedness of all entities to consciousness somehow captures the ontological sense of those entities."⁵⁴ And in fact in Draft D Husserl dropped this Introduction entirely.

DRAFT D (NOVEMBER, 1927)

The dating of Draft D. Husserl reduced the fifty-two typed pages of Draft C to the thirty-five pages of Draft D sometime between November 1 and December 1, 1927. The *terminus a quo* of these dates is calculated from Roman Ingarden's departure from Freiburg on October 31 after he had

⁵²But in a letter to Roman Ingarden (January 1, 1929) Husserl referred to the two Lectures by the titles (1) "Phänom[enologie] u[nd] Psychologie" and (2) "Transcend[entale] Phänom[enologie]": *Briefwechsel III*, p. 245.

⁵³B, p. 2.2-9, partially omitted by Biemel at *Hu IX*, p. 256.24-31.

⁵⁴C 1b = *Hu IX*, p. 517.39-40, emphasis added.

read (perhaps only some of) Draft C. The *terminus ad quem* is calculated from a letter that Husserl addressed to Heidegger on December 8, 1927:

Freiburg 8.XII.27

Dear friend,

[...] Many thanks for your lovely letter.⁵⁵ Why did I not answer [your letter of October 22], why did I not write at all? Naturally because of a lack of inner calm. The new version of the London Article, now very carefully thought out and arranged,⁵⁶ turned out nicely, although quite differently from the way you would like to have it, even though something essential [of your suggestions] was retained. In the end it was -- and I left it -- altogether too long, but I did not want to have to do anything more with it, and it just could not be shortened any further. So I sent it off to England and still have no answer. An expanded version, which takes into consideration a topic that went untreated -- the double meaning of psychology: as naturalistic and as humanistically oriented (my old antithesis) -- should go into the *Jahrbuch* as an introduction to further publications.

Very cordial greetings from our family to yours,
Your faithful friend,
EH⁵⁷

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

⁵⁵Presumably not the letter of October 22 but one that arrived close to December 8, inquiring why Husserl had not answered that of October 22.

⁵⁶A reference, perhaps, to Heidegger's suggestions, in Appendix II of his October 22 letter, about the arrangement of Part II of the Article.

⁵⁷*Briefwechsel* IV, p. 149.

at the very least one week before December 8, that is, on or before December 1.

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

It should be noted that on p. 1 of the typed original, D1, Husserl wrote in shorthand: "A draft of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Article. The brackets are merely indications for the proposed abridgments, so as to stay within the restricted length of the English version (Salmon)."⁵⁸ However, I have not found any significant bracketings of large sections of material in D1.⁵⁹

⁵⁸"Ein Entwurf zum Artikel der *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, die Einklammerungen sind bloß Anzeigen für Verkürzungen, vorgeschlagen um den vorgeschriebenen engen Raum des englischen Artikels (Salmon) innehalten zu können." *Hu IX*, 592 and 605.

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

TRANSITION FROM:			
DRAFT C		TO	
DRAFT C		DRAFT D	
INTRODUCTION			
1 a b c d		1a (returns to, and rewrites, A1)	
PART I PURE PSYCHOLOGY: ITS FIELD OF EXPERIENCE, ITS METHOD, AND FUNCTION			
1 2 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 6 7 8 8a 9 10 11 12 13 13a ----- 13b -----		1b §1 2 §2 --- 3 --- 4 5 6 §3 7 8 9 §4 10 §5 11 --- 11a --- 11b	278.8 279.6 281.24 284.4 285.3
PART II PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY			
14 15 16 17 18 19 ----- 20 21 ----- 22 23 24 25 26 ----- 27 ----- 28		12 §6 13 §7 --- 16 §8 --- 17 --- 18 19 §9 20 21 --- 22 --- 23 24 §10	287.2 288.14 290.11 292.10 295.7

29 30	25
----------	----

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

-----		26	§11	296.22
31			§12	297.16
32		27	§13	298.1
33				
34				
35				
36				
37	Cut entirely. ⁶⁰			
38				
39				
40		--- 28	§14	298.25
41			§15	299.3
42		29		
43 top half -----				
43 bottom half -----		--- 29b	§16	299.33
44 -----		--- 30		
45 top half -----		--- 31		
bottom half -----				

⁶⁰These pages are translated below, Draft C, "From the Later Pages of the Third Draft."

**DRAFT D
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION

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

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

**PART II
PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND TRANSCENDENTAL
PHENOMENOLOGY**

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

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

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



DRAFT E
(DECEMBER 1, 1927 TO FEBRUARY [MARCH?], 1928)

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

Christopher V. Salmon. Having received his M.A. in philosophy at Oxford, Christopher Verney Salmon studied with Husserl in Freiburg during the winter semester of 1922 and again during 1926-1927.⁶¹ In the summer of 1927 Salmon defended the doctoral dissertation that he had written under Husserl's direction, "The Central Problem of Hume's Philosophy: A Phenomenological Interpretation of the First Book of the *Treatise on Human Nature*."⁶² The work was published a year later in Husserl's *Jahrbuch*, and Husserl refers to that forthcoming publication in his Bibliography to Draft A of the Article.⁶³ A year after translating the EB Article, Salmon was appointed a lecturer at the University of Belfast, and he continued to present Husserl's philosophy to the English-speaking public. On December 2, 1929 he delivered a lecture to the Aristotelian Society in London, "The Starting-Point of Husserl's Philosophy."⁶⁴ Soon after that he helped W.R.B. Gibson read the page proofs of Gibson's translation of Husserl's *Ideas*,⁶⁵ and in 1932, a year after the work came out in English, Salmon published a review of it.⁶⁶ However, contact between Salmon and Husserl fell off after that, and in the spring of 1937 Husserl noted that Professor Salmon had not written to him over the last years.⁶⁷ Salmon published a brief article in French on Husserl in 1947.⁶⁸ He died in 1960.

⁶¹See, respectively: *Briefwechsel* III, p. 44 (December 13, 1922, to Winthrop Pickard Bell) and VI, p. 136 (October 23, 1929, to W.R.B. Gibson). On Husserl's estimation of him as *hochbegabter Engländer*, see W.R. Boyce Gibson, "From Husserl to Heidegger: Excerpts from a 1928 Freiburg

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

(1) Salmon having already agreed to translate the EB Article into English, Husserl sent him Draft D by December 1, 1927. (Salmon was then residing at 14 St. Giles St., Oxford, England.⁶⁹) To save retyping the bibliography that had been prepared for Draft A, Husserl appended to Draft D the last two pages of Draft A2 (pp. 24 and 25) -- that is, the bibliography plus the last seven lines of text of that first draft.

Diary," ed. Herbert Spiegelberg, *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 2 (1971), 58-83: p. 63; see also pp. 66 and 71.

⁶²Husserl's evaluation of the work is found in *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 469-470 (July 12, 1927: Gutachten über Salmons Dissertation).

⁶³*Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* X (1929), 299-449; incorrectly cited as "X (1928)" in *Briefwechsel* IV, p. 469, n. 1. The work was likewise published in Halle by Niemeyer in the same year. (For the correct date, see Schuhmann, "Husserl's Yearbook," p. 20.) The Bibliography to Draft A refers to the forthcoming work simply as: "Chr. Salmon, Hume's Philosophy (in English)."

⁶⁴Published under that title in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, new series, 30 (1930), 55-78. Husserl mentions the lecture in *Briefwechsel* VI, p. 137 (October 28, 1929, to Gibson).

⁶⁵*Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 136-140 (1929-30, various letters to Gibson), and Gibson's glowing remarks in the "Translator's Preface" to Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1931 (reprinted: New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 24.

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

⁶⁷*Briefwechsel* IV, p. 372 (May 5, 1937, to Landgrebe).

⁶⁸"La phénoménologie après Husserl," in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 31 (1947), 237-240.

⁶⁹*Briefwechsel* IV, p. 152 (March 5, 1928, to Heidegger)

(2) In the three months between early December 1927 and the end of February 1928 Salmon produced two quite similar -- but chronologically distinct -- versions of Draft E, which we call E1 and E2. Each of these two versions had a typed original (which we call "a") and a carbon copy ("b"). The Husserl Archives preserves, under the signature M III 10, the carbon copy of E1 (= E1b), which is catalogued as "II 2" and the typed original of E2 (= E2a), which is catalogued as "II 1."⁷⁰ Those texts came about as follows:

(3) In December and/or January Salmon produced E1, both in a typed original (E1a) and a carbon copy (E1b). He retained the typed original in Oxford (it is now lost) and mailed the carbon, E1b, to Husserl in Freiburg.⁷¹

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

Herrn Geheimrat Edmund Husserl

⁷⁰Hence: M III 10 II, 2 and II, 1. Herbert Spiegelberg's comment that "All that can now be found in the Husserl Archives is the dedicated personal copy of Salmon's typescript without reading marks" ("On the Misfortunes of Edmund Husserl's Article," pp. 19f.) has proven not to be correct. Spiegelberg is referring to E2b (M III 10 II 1). However, both E1b and E2a can be found in the Husserl Archives, Leuven.

⁷¹Salmon himself had written in some corrections, by hand, in the carbon copy. In E1b, for example, Salmon adds "Par." ("Paragraph"), plus a number, at each title of the sub-divisions; he also corrects a typographical error ("International" for "Intentional" in the title of §1); etc. The title of §2 is corrected (perhaps by a hand other than Salmon's?) from "...Psychical Psychological..." to "...Phenomenological Psychology...", and so forth.

with Affection and all Respect
from
Christopher V. Salmon.
Feb. 1928.

(5) On Wednesday, February 29, 1928, Husserl and Heidegger met in Freiburg as each one was going his separate way to vacations in the Black Forest: Heidegger to Todtnauberg, Husserl to Breitnau.⁷² It was at this meeting that Husserl consigned to Heidegger the manuscript of the lectures on internal time-consciousness, which Heidegger had agreed to edit. By accident, however, Husserl had left inside the folder of the manuscript some four pages from E1b. Husserl had already corrected these pages but had failed to send them back to Salmon. Therefore, on March 5, 1928, Husserl sent a letter to Heidegger in Todtnauberg:

Dear friend,

In the folder with the time manuscript (which I originally had wanted to take with me to Breitnau) there are some pages from the English version of my Encyclopaedia Article: Salmon's typewritten pages, to which I added corrections. Would you please send these pages, as my corrections, *directly* to Chr. V. Salmon, Oxford, 14 St. Giles, with a simple note saying they are from me. I am also writing to him directly.⁷³

⁷²See Husserl/Jaspers, *Briefwechsel* p. 90-1 (February 25 and March 6, 1928, Heidegger to Jaspers). On February 25 Heidegger had received the official "call" to be Husserl's successor in the chair of philosophy at Freiburg, effective October 1 of that year, and of course he and Husserl would have discussed that during their visit in Freiburg.

⁷³The letter continues: "I got a sore throat in Breitnau, with a cold, etc., so despite the wonderful weather I had to come home on Sunday [March 4] already. Fortunately it is not a flu, but I still have to stay in bed about two more days and gulp down aspirin. / Best wishes. Surely you are enjoying the lovely weather. Are you able to ski [in Todtnauberg]? All the best to your wife, / Yours, / EH." *Briefwechsel* IV, pp. 152-153.

(6) The (four) pages that Husserl was referring to, and that Heidegger did indeed send on to Salmon, were pp. 14-16 and p. 20; they are missing from E1b.⁷⁴ We are faced, then, with the anomaly of Husserl sending off corrections to E1 in early March 1928 after Salmon had already typed up and dedicated E2 in late February. Moreover, there is no manuscript evidence that the pages of E2 that correspond to the missing pages of E1 were changed by Salmon in any significant way.⁷⁵ It seems, then, that Husserl's effort to amend some pages of Draft E failed. Salmon sent off E2b to the editorial offices of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in London (and E2a to Husserl in Freiburg) without benefit of Husserl's suggestions.

FROM DRAFT E TO DRAFT F (MARCH 1928--SEPTEMBER 1929)

The structure of Drafts E and F: One should not conflate Draft E, and specifically E2, with the version that was finally published in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1929. E2 is the twenty-five-page typescript that Salmon submitted to the London offices of the *Britannica* around March of 1928. Itself a radical condensation of Husserl's Draft D, Draft E2 was further cut back by the editors of the *Britannica* -- two full pages were omitted -- before getting into print. We call the published version Draft F.⁷⁶

⁷⁴Pages 14-16 correspond to material from §9 of Draft D, while p. 20 corresponds to material from §15.

⁷⁵While it is true that the first five lines of p. 13 of E2 do not follow from p. 12 (indicating that p. 12 was retyped), they are not changed at all from the last five lines of p. 12. I take it this indicates that Salmon did not appropriate any suggestions for Husserl at this point.

⁷⁶Besides omitting the two pages, the editors also made some orthographical changes in the text. Whereas Salmon tends to capitalize a number of words -- for example: Reflection, Phenomena, Intentional, Perception, Imagined, Remembered, Copied -- the editors put such terms in lower case. The editors, however, repeated Salmon's erroneous accents on two Greek words: Salmon's γϕδοϛ

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

instead of γένεσις, and his νῆρω instead of νοχῶ.

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

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

DRAFT E in relation to DRAFT D	
Introduction (untitled)	
PART I PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY	
§1. Natural Science and Psychology, Intentional Experience	
Part I:	
§1	Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology
§2	The Purely Psychical in Self-experience and Community Experience. The Universal Description of Intentional Experiences.
§2. The closed Field of the Phenomenological-Psychological and Eidetic Reductions	
§3	The Self-contained Field of the Purely Psychical. -- Phenomenological Reduction and True Inner Experience.
§4	Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as an Eidetic Science
§5	The Fundamental Function of Pure Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Science
PART II TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY	
§3. Locke and Descartes, and the Problems of Transcendental Philosophy	
Part II:	
§6	Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Pocke's Psychologism
§10	Pure Psychology as Propaedeutic to Transcendental Phenomenology
§8	The Solution by Psychologism mixed together as a Transcendental Circle
§7	The Transcendental Problem
§9	The Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction and the Semblance of Transcendental Doubling
§4. Phenomenology, the Universal Science	
Part III:	
§11	Transcendental Phenomenology as Ontology
§12	Phenomenology and the Crisis of Foundations in the Exact Sciences
§14	Complete Phenomenology as All-embracing Philosophy

§13	The Phenomenological Grounding of the Factual Sciences, and Empirical Phenomenology
§15	The "Ultimate and Highest" Problems as Phenomenological
§16	The Phenomenological Resolution of All Philosophical Antitheses

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The lifespan of Draft F: 1929-1956. By September of 1929 it was over: the 4000-word Draft F of the Article was published in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* over the signature "E. Hu."⁷⁷ Although this fourteen edition stayed in print (with various up-dates and revisions) until 1974, Husserl's entry "Phenomenology" survived only until 1956, when it was replaced by another article with the same title, written by John N. Findlay. After it went out of print with the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1956, Husserl's Draft F was republished, with one important orthographical correction -- and one glaring mistake -- in Roderick M. Chisholm's collection, *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*.⁷⁸ In 1966 Findlay's text was replaced by one written by Herbert Spiegelberg. Beginning with the fifteenth edition of the *Britannica* (1974), the article "Phenomenology" was embedded within the larger entry "Philosophical Schools and Doctrines," and Spiegelberg's text, in a curious editorial amalgamation, got rearranged and merged with a text written by Walter Biemel. In 1986 the Spiegelberg-Biemel article was dropped in favor of a short summary-article on phenomenology written by *Britannica* staffers.⁷⁹

⁷⁷*The Encyclopaedia Britannica: A New Survey of Universal Knowledge*, 14th edition London and New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1929, vol. 17 ("P to Planting of Trees"), pp. 699-702. The identification of the author is given in that same volume on p. viii: "Edmund Husserl. Professor of Philosophy, University of Freiberg [sic]."

⁷⁸Roderick M. Chisholm, ed., *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*, New York and Glencoe: Free Press, 1960, pp. 118-128. The orthographical correction: from Salmon's erroneous "phenomenalists" to the correct translation "phenomenologists" in the last sentence. The glaring mistake: the translator was identified (in this, the year he died) as "Christopher V. Solomon."

⁷⁹The fifteen edition was the one newly designed by Mortimer Adler and others (Micropaedia, Macropaedia, Proppaedia). I am grateful to Mr. Sherman Hollar of the *Britannica* offices in Chicago for the information in this paragraph on the editorial history of the article.

