

EDMUND HUSSERL

"PHENOMENOLOGY"

THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA* ARTICLE

#### EDITORIAL NOTES ON THE PRESENT EDITION OF THE EB ARTICLE

##### **Page and line references:**

Within the text of our translation we provide the pagination of the German texts:

- (a) The pagination of the version published in *Hu IX* is given within square brackets, for example: [p. 237].
- (b) The pagination of the original 1927 typescripts is given within angle brackets, for example: <p. 1>.

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

- (a) "*Hu IX*, p. 238.9" refers to page 238, line 9 of the published German version.
- (b) "A1, p. 1.21" refers to page 1, line 21 of the typed manuscript of Draft A.

##### **Heidegger's comments on Drafts A and B:**

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

- (a) Comments on the first draft (A) are found at pp. 592-97, as well as in some of the footnotes to the published version, pp. 239-53.
- (b) Those on the second draft (B) are found at pp. 579-600 and 603-5, as well as in some of the footnotes to the published version.
- (c) Heidegger's letter of October 22, 1927, with its three appendices, is published in *Hu IX*, pp. 600-02, and in *Briefwechsel IV*, pp. 144-148.

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

##### **The text of Draft B:**

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

In the present translation of the second draft -- as contrasted with the edition in *Hu IX* and all previous translations in any language -- the "Introduction" and "Part I," which were written by Heidegger, follow *Heidegger's original* text as it appears in B1. The amendments and substitutions made to that text by both Heidegger and Husserl are given in the footnotes. The reason for this is that we have wanted to present the original text that Heidegger read and commented on, rather than the text as Husserl revised it afterwards and in the light of Heidegger's comments. However, within the sections that Husserl contributed -- that is, Part II -- we follow the text from Draft B2.

##### **Pagination in Draft B, Sections ii-a, ii-b, and iii:**

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

***Regarding paragraph breaks:***

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

***Regarding section titles within brackets:***

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

EDMUND HUSSERL  
"PHENOMENOLOGY"  
THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA ARTICLE  
DRAFT A

Translated by Thomas Sheehan

EDMUND HUSSERL

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA ARTICLE

DRAFT A

[p. 237] <p. 1>

[Introduction]

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

I. PSYCHOLOGICAL PHENOMENOLOGY AS "PURE" PSYCHOLOGY

[Phenomenological Reflection<sup>3</sup>]

1. Every experience and every other way we are consciously involved with objects clearly allows of a "phenomenological turn," a transferral into a process of "phenomenological experience." In simple perception we are directed toward perceived matters, in memory toward remembered matters, in thinking toward thoughts, in valuing toward values, in willing toward ends and means, and so on. Thus every such pursuit has its "object" [Thema]. But at any given time we can effect a change of focus that shifts our thematic gaze away from the current matters, thoughts, values, ends, etc., and directs our gaze instead toward the manifoldly changing "subjective ways" in which<sup>4</sup> they

---

<sup>3</sup>Hu IX, p. 238.9-240.4. The material under this heading generally corresponds to some of the material in Draft D §2, "The Pure Psychological [etc]."

<sup>4</sup>Heidegger (A1, p. 1.21, within the text) changes Husserl's German from "wie"

"appear," the ways they are consciously known. For example, to perceive a fixed and unchanged brass cube means to run through its form as a cube -- the individual surfaces, edges, corners, as well as its color, luster and other determinations as a spatial thing -- [p. 238] and thus to bring the cube to cognizance for oneself.

But instead of proceeding like that, we can attend phenomenologically to how -- for example, in what kind of variously changing "perspectives" -- <p. 2> the cube presents itself and yet is still experienced as unchanged; or how the very same cube appears differently as "something nearby" than as "something far off"; or which modes of appearance it offers when we change our orientation; and also how each individual determination within the process of perception presents itself as the one determination in the multiple modes of appearance belonging particularly to that perception.

This return to reflective experience teaches us that there is no progressively perceived thing, nor any element perceived as a determination within it, that does not appear, during perception, in multiplicities of different appearances, even though it is given and grasped as continuously one and the same thing. But in normal<sup>5</sup> ongoing perception, only this unity, only the thing itself, stands in the comprehending gaze while the functioning processes of lived experience remain extra-thematic, ungrasped, and latent. Perception is not some empty "having" of perceived things, but rather a flowing lived experience of subjective appearances synthetically uniting themselves in a consciousness of the self-same entity existing in this way or that. In this connection, "modes of appearance" is to be taken in the broadest sense. Thus, in the recollection of the cube or in the imagining of an entirely similar one, the modes of appearance are "the same" as in the perception [of the cube], but each of them is modified in a certain way, precisely insofar as it deals with memory or imagination. Again, differences such as those between a clearer and a more obscure memory, or those between

---

to "**in denen**," i.e., from "how" or "as" to "**in which**." (Cf. *Hu IX*, p. 237.20). Unless otherwise noted, Heidegger's remarks appear in the left margin of Husserl's texts.

<sup>5</sup>Heidegger (*A1*, p. 2.13, within the text) changes "normal" [normal] to "**unreflective**" [unreflektiert]. See *Hu IX*, p. 238.15.

gradations of clarity, or even between levels of relative definiteness or indefiniteness, are differences within the "modes of appearance." So too with differences of time-perspectives, <p. 3> of attention, and so forth.

Quite analogously,<sup>6</sup> the thoughts, values, decisions, etc., in the corresponding lived experiences of thinking, valuing, willing, etc., are unities of hiddenly functioning "modes of appearance." For example,<sup>7</sup> the same judgment, with the same subject and predicate, is consciously known, within thinking, according to changing modes: sometimes as evident, sometimes as not evident; and in the latter case, sometimes as explicitly judged in step-by-step action and other times as not explicitly judged but rather as something that comes vaguely to mind. In these cases, in the transition from one mode to the other [p. 239] there arises the identifying consciousness of the same judgment, meant sometimes in one mode and sometimes in another. What holds true for the whole of a judgment or even a proof, or for a whole theory, also holds true for every thematic element, for every concept, every form of judgment, etc., [within that whole]. Here too, as everywhere else, the thematic unity is constituted in the synthesis of multiplicities of "phenomena" <p. 4> that are hidden but that can be disclosed at any time by means of phenomenological reflection, analysis, and description.

Thus there arises the idea of a universal task: Instead of living in "the" world directly in the "natural attitude" and, so to speak, like "children of this world"; that is, instead of living within the latently functioning life of consciousness and thereby having the world, and it alone, as our field of being -- as now-existing for us (from out of perception), as past (from out of memory), as coming in the future (from out of expectation) - - instead of judging and valuing this world of experience and making it the

---

<sup>6</sup>The remainder of this sentence stems from Landgrebe, who substitutes it for some fourteen typed lines in Husserl's text: A1, p. 3.2-16. For the omitted text see *Hu IX*, p. 593, note to p. 238.32-35. We give Landgrebe's version, because the correction seems to have been made before the text was sent to Heidegger.

<sup>7</sup>Heidegger's note (A1, p. 3.17, shorthand; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 593):

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

field of theoretical or practical projects -- instead of all that, we attempt a universal phenomenological reflection on this entire life-process, be it pre-theoretical, theoretical or whatever. We attempt to disclose it systematically and thereby to understand the "how" of its achieving of unities; thus we seek to understand: in what manifold typical forms this life is a "consciousness-of"; how it constitutes synthetically conscious unities; how and in which forms these syntheses, as syntheses of passivity and spontaneous activity, run their course and thereby in particular how their unities are constituted as objectively existing or not existing, and the like; and thus finally how a unified world of experience and knowledge is there, operative and valid for us, in a completely familiar set of ontic types.

If it is the case that whatever is experienced, whatever is thought, and whatever is seen as the truth are given and are possible only within [the corresponding acts of] experiencing, thinking, and insight, then the concrete and complete exploration of the world that exists and has scientific and evidential validity for us requires also the universal phenomenological exploration of the multiplicities of consciousness in whose synthetic changes the world subjectively takes shape as valid for us and perhaps as given with insight.<sup>8</sup> The task extends to the whole [p. 240] of life -- including aesthetic life, valuing life of whatever type, <p. 5> and practical life -- through which the concrete life-world with its changing content likewise continuously takes shape for us as a value-world and a practical world.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Heidegger's note (A1 p. 4.24, German cursive; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 239.32 and n. 1): Heidegger underlines erfordert ["requires"] twice and writes:

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

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

<sup>9</sup>The text here reflects Landgrebe's changes in Husserl's text: A1, p. 5.2-4; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 593, note to p. 240.2-4. As the typing of A1, p. 4 shows, Landgrebe's changes were made before the A1 was sent to Heidegger.

2. Does posing the task in this way lead to a new science?<sup>11</sup> Is there -- corresponding to the idea of a universal experience directed exclusively to "subjective phenomena" -- a self-contained field of experience that stands over against universal experience of the world, and thus a basis for a self-contained science? At first one may object that a new science is not required, since all merely subjective phenomena, all modes of appearance of what appears, belong naturally within psychology as the science of the psychic.<sup>12</sup>

<p. 5a> Doubtless that is true. However, it leaves open [the fact] that<sup>13</sup> a purely self-contained psychological discipline is required here<sup>14</sup> in much the same way that a [pure science of] mechanics is required for an exclusively theoretical inquiry into movement and moving forces (taken as a mere structure

<sup>10</sup>Hu IX, p. 240.5-241.36. The material under this heading generally corresponds to some of the material in Draft D §1, "Pure Natural Science and Pure Psychology."

<sup>11</sup>Heidegger's note (A1, p. 5.6-7; cf. Hu IX, p. 593):

**"Cf. 5a below."**

Disposition of the note:

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

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

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

<sup>12</sup>At this point in both A1 and A2 (where p. 5.13 = Hu IX, p. 240.14) the second half of the page is crossed out along with the first three lines of p. 6; the deleted passage is reproduced in Hu IX, p. 593. For this deleted passage Husserl substitutes ms. p. 5a, which follows.

<sup>13</sup>Heidegger (A2, p. 5a.1, within the text) changes "daß" ("[the fact] that") to "ob" ("whether"), thus changing the reading to: "...it leaves open [the question] whether...."

<sup>14</sup>In A2, p. 5a.3-5, the remainder of this sentence is crossed out -- although it is retained in Hu IX, p. 15-18 -- and may be the referent of Heidegger's marginal note in the previous paragraph.

of nature).

Let us consider the matter more closely. What is the general theme of psychology? Answer: Psychical being<sup>15</sup> and psychical life that exist concretely in the world as human and, more generally, as animal. Accordingly, psychology is a branch of the more concrete sciences of anthropology or zoology. Animal realities are of two levels, the first level being the basic one of physical realities. For, like all realities, animal realities are spatio-temporal, and they admit of a systematically abstractive focus of experience upon that factor in them that is purely "res extensa." This reduction to the purely physical brings us into the self-contained nexus of physical nature, to which animal organisms, as mere bodies, belong. Consequently, scientific exploration of this area takes its place within the universal unity of natural science and specifically within physical biology as the general science of organisms in purely physical experience.

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

<p. 6><sup>16</sup> All specifically psychological concepts obviously stem from purely psychic experience, just as all specifically natural (natural-scientific) concepts stem from purely natural experience. Thus every

---

<sup>15</sup>Heidegger (A2, p. 5a.6, within the text) changes Husserl's "psychical being" [Seelisches Sein] to "**psychical entities**" (**Seelisch Seiendes**). ("Seelisches [also Seelisch] is capitalized because it begins the sentence.") See *Hu IX*, p. 240.19.

<sup>16</sup>The first two-and-a-half lines of A1, p. 6 are crossed out. Those lines, plus the second half of p. 5.14-27, were dropped in favor of p. 5a.

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

Within the natural apperception of a human being taken as a concrete reality, there is already given his or her psychic subjectivity, the manifold [dimensions of the] psychic that can be experienced as a surplus over and above his or her corporeal physis and as a self-contained unity and totality of experience. If a "soul" (in this sense of experience) has a general structural essence -- the typical form of its structure as regards psychic conditions, acts, and forms of a pure psychic synthesis -- then the basic task of psychology, as first and foremost a "pure" psychology, must be to systematically explore these typical forms. However large the domain of psychophysical research may be, and however much it may contribute to our knowledge of the soul, there is one thing it can do only on the basis of a pure psychology, namely, exhibit the real relations of the psychic to physis. All the indirect indications of the psychic that are possible here, presuppose scientific experience of the purely psychic and knowledge of its essential structures.<sup>17</sup>

[Original Intuitive Experience: Two Levels]

<p. 7><sup>18</sup> All experiential knowledge rests finally on original experience, on perception and the originally presentiating variations that derive from

---

<sup>17</sup>In the bottom margin of A1, p. 6.27 Husserl adds in shorthand: "Accordingly, among the 'basic concepts' of psychology -- the original elements of psychological theory -- the purely psychological concepts have intrinsic priority and precede psychophysical concepts and therefore all psychological concepts in general." (This sentence is taken over at this point in *Hu IX*, p. 241.32-36.) This shorthand sentence in A1 may be a replacement for the words "the ultimate theoretical elements of all psychology, which precede all other psychological concepts" from the next paragraph, which are crossed out in A1, p. 7.6-7 (but retained in *Hu IX*, p. 242.3-5).

<sup>18</sup>At this point in the typed ms. Husserl substitutes two typed pages, 7 and 7a, for a previous page 7. The first four lines of ms. p. 8, which followed from the original p. 7, are crossed out. They are reproduced in *Hu IX*, pp. 594.

it.<sup>19</sup> [p. 242] Without an original intuitive example there is no original universalizing, no concept-formation. The same holds here. All of pure psychology's basic concepts -- the ultimate theoretical elements of all psychology,<sup>20</sup> which precede all other psychological concepts -- must be drawn from original psychological intuition.<sup>21</sup> Such intuition has two levels: self-experience and intersubjective experience.<sup>22</sup>

The first,<sup>23</sup> which itself is gradated according to originality, is carried out in the form of self-perception and its variations (remembering oneself, imagining oneself); this provides the psychologist with original psychological intuitions, but only of his or her own (present, past, etc.) psychic [experience]. Obviously<sup>24</sup> the sense of any<sup>25</sup> experience of someone else's "interiority" implies that his or her interiority is an analogous variation of my own, such that the other person's interiority,<sup>26</sup> can fit under

<sup>19</sup>Heidegger's note (A2, p. 7.1-5; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 594):

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

<sup>20</sup>Heidegger (A2, p. 7.6; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 594) writes

**"Cf. p. 11."**

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

<sup>21</sup>Heidegger (A2, p. 7.8) suggests changing the passage to read: "**must be drawn from original intuition of the psychic as such.**" Husserl carries the change over into A1, p. 7.8 (= *Hu IX*, p. 242.6-7).

<sup>22</sup>Heidegger's note (A2, p. 7.10; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 594):

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

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

<sup>23</sup>Heidegger (A2, p. 7.10, in the text) suggests beginning the sentence with "**the former**" (Jene: not Diese as in *Hu IX*, p. 594, note to p. 242.9), just as he will suggest beginning the next sentence with "**the former**." See the following footnote.

<sup>24</sup>Heidegger (A2, p. 7.14) suggests use of "the latter" (diese) here, so as to read perhaps: "**In the latter case obviously...**" Husserl does not carry over the suggestion into A2 (*Hu IX*, p. 242.14).

<sup>25</sup>Heidegger (A2, p. 7.15, within the text) adds the word "**intersubjektiven**" ["intersubjective"] at this point.

<sup>26</sup>Husserl (A1 and A2, p. 7.16) adds "as an individual psyche," at this point. Cf. *Hu IX*, p. 242.16.

the same basic concepts as (and no other than) those I originally fashioned from my experience of myself. Yes, the experience of personal community and community life, which is founded in experience of the self and of the other, does indeed yield new concepts, but they are concepts that in any case presuppose the concepts of self-experience.<sup>27</sup>

**[Original Intuitive Experience of Oneself]**

If we now ask what it is that first of all brings self-experience, both actual and possible, originarily to intuition, then Descartes' classical formula, the ego cogito, provides the only possible answer to that question -- so long as we leave aside all the concerns that determined him in a transcendental- philosophical way. In other words, we hit upon nothing other than the ego, consciousness, and the conscious object as such. <p. 7a> In its purity, the psychic is nothing other than what we might call the specifically egoical: the life of consciousness and being-as-ego within that life. If, when we consider the human community, we also maintain a firm focus on the purely psychic, then over and above the pure individual subjects (psyches), there arise intersubjectivity's modes of consciousness that bind those subjects together on a purely psychic level. Among these are the "social acts" (appealing to other persons, making agreements with them, subduing their wills, and so on)<sup>28</sup> as well as, related to those, the abiding interpersonal bonds linking pure [p. 243] persons to personal communities at different levels. <p. 8><sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>Heidegger's note (A2, p. 7.16-21, keyed to the end of this sentence but apparently pertaining to the last two sentences of the paragraph; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 594):

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

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

<sup>28</sup>The remainder of this sentence (= *Hu IX*, p. 242.37-243.2) appears in A1 and A2, p. 7a.8 as a shorthand addition by Husserl.

<sup>29</sup>Regarding what immediately follows in Draft A, p. 8: The first four lines of p. 8 are crossed out (this was part of the substitution of pp. 7 and 7a for the original p. 7) and the next fifteen lines are bracketed. The omitted text is reproduced in *Hu IX*, pp. 594-595.

3. The correct performance of a pure phenomenological reflection, as an originary intuition of the psychic in its pure particularity, is fraught with great difficulties; and the possibility of a pure psychology -- and hence, of any psychology at all -- depends on recognizing and overcoming them.<sup>31</sup> The method of "phenomenological reduction" is the basic method for throwing into relief the phenomenological-psychological field, and it alone has made "pure psychology" possible.

Let us, for example, <p. 9> try to grasp and describe any kind of external perception -- say, the perception of this tree -- as a purely psychic datum. Naturally the tree itself, which stands there in the garden, belongs not to the perception but to extra-mental nature. Nevertheless, the perception is what it is -- namely, something psychic -- [only] insofar as it is a perception "of this tree." Without the "of this" or "of that," a perception cannot be described in its own essential psychic make-up. The inseparability of this element is shown by the fact that it remains with the perception even when the perception is shown to be an illusion. Whether the natural object truly exists or not, the perception is a perception of it and is given to me in phenomenological reflection as that.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Hu IX, p. 243.3-244.29. The material under this heading corresponds generally to Draft D, §3, "The Self-contained Field of the Purely Psychical. -- Phenomenological Reduction and True Inner Experience."

<sup>31</sup> Heidegger's note (A1, p. 8.20-27, left and bottom margins, keyed to the first two sentences of this paragraph):

**"More succinctly:  
The possibility of a pure psychology in general depends on the correct performance of the original intuition of the psychic as such. This performance is determined and guided by the 'phenomenological reduction.' The essential characteristics of this method are the following:**

1. a view of the psychic as essentially intentional;
2. in connection with that, the epoché;
3. constitution of the intentum in the multiplicity of its modes of appearance;
4. [the] universal validity of this basic structure of the method in keeping with the universality of the intentional structure."

<sup>32</sup> Heidegger (A1, p. 9.11, within the text) changes als das ("as that") to als

Thus, in order to grasp the purely psychic [element] of a cogito of the type "perception," the psychologist must, on the one hand, abstain from taking any position on the actual being of the perceived (i.e., of the cogitatum); that is, he must perform an epoché as regards that and thereafter make no natural perceptual judgments, since the very sense of such judgments always entails an assertion about objective being and non-being. On the other hand,<sup>33</sup> however, the most essential thing of all should not be overlooked, namely that even after this purifying epoché, perception still remains perception of this house, indeed, of this house with the accepted status of "actually existing." In other words, the pure make-up of my perception includes the perceptual object -- but purely as perceptually meant, and specifically as the sense-content (the perceptual sense) of the perceptual belief.

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

In each case the reduction to the phenomenological, as the purely psychic, demands that we methodically refrain from taking any natural-objective position; and not only that, but also from taking any position on the particular values, goods, etc., that the subject, in his or her naturally functioning cogitationes, straightforwardly accepts as valid in

---

solches ("as such"). Cf. *Hu* IX, p. 243.23.

<sup>33</sup>Heidegger's note (A1, p. 9.19-25, keyed to this and the next sentence; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 595):

<p>"Make this point at the beginning, and from that the necessity of the epoché will become clear."</p>
---

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

any given case. In each instance the task is to pursue the at first incalculable plethora of modes in which the respective "intentional objectivities" (the perceived as such, the remembered as such, the thought and the valued as such, etc.) are gradually "constituted" as synthetic unities of multiplicities of consciousness; the task is also to disclose the manifold forms of syntheses whereby, in general, consciousness combines with consciousness into the unity of a consciousness.<sup>34</sup> But other than "consciousness-of" -- always centered on the same pole of unity, the ego -- there is nothing to be found here. Every psychic datum can itself be exhibited only as a unity that refers back to constituting multiplicities. Pure psychology (and consequently any psychology at all) must begin with the data of actual experience, that is to say, with my pure egoical lived experiences as perceptions-of, remembrances-of, and things of that sort, and never with hypotheses and abstractions, such as "sense data" and the like are.

**[Eidetic Reduction. Pure Eidetic Psychology as the Foundation  
for Empirical Psychology<sup>35</sup> ]**

4. Phenomenological or pure psychology as an intrinsically primary and completely self-contained psychological discipline, which is also <p. 11> sharply separated from natural science, is, for very fundamental reasons, not to be established as an empirical science but rather as a purely rational ("a priori," "eidetic") science. As such<sup>36</sup> it is the necessary foundation for any

---

<sup>34</sup>Heidegger's note (A1, p.10.20; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 595):

**"Cf. p. 11"**

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

<sup>35</sup>*Hu IX*, p. 244.30-247.3. The material under this heading corresponds to material found in Draft §5, "The Fundamental Function of Pure Phenomenological Psychology for an Exact Empirical Psychology" and § 4, "Eidetic Reduction and Phenomenological Psychology as an Eidetic Science."

<sup>36</sup>Heidegger's note (A1, p. 11.6):

**"Cf. p. 7"**

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

rigorous empirical science dealing with the laws of the psychic, quite the same way that the purely rational disciplines of nature -- pure geometry, kinematics, chronology, mechanics -- are the foundation for every possible "exact" empirical science of nature. [p. 245] Just as the grounding of such an empirical science would require a systematic disclosure of the essential forms of nature in general, without which it is not possible to think nature -- and more specifically, spatial and temporal form, movement, change, physical substantiality and causality -- so too a scientifically "exact" psychology requires a disclosure of the a priori typical forms without which it is not possible to think the I (or the we), consciousness, the objects of consciousness, and hence any psychic life at all, along with all the distinctions and essentially possible forms of syntheses that are inseparable from the idea of an individual and communal psychic whole.

Accordingly, the method of phenomenological reduction is connected with the method of psychological inquiry into essence, as eidetic inquiry:<sup>37</sup> that is to say, exclusion not only of all judgments that go beyond pure conscious life (exclusion, therefore, of all natural positive sciences) but also of all purely psychological factuality. Such factuality serves only as an exemplar, a basis for the free variation of possibilities, whereas what we are seeking to ascertain is the invariant that emerges in the variation, the necessary typical form, which is bound up with the ability to be thought. So, for example, the phenomenology of the perception of spatial things is not a doctrine about <p. 12><sup>38</sup> external perceptions that either factually occur or

---

about concepts as first theoretical elements."

<sup>37</sup>Heidegger's note (A1, p. 11.18-20):

"Cf. p. 10."

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

<sup>38</sup>Here at the beginning of A2, p. 12, in the top margin, Heidegger writes (and underlines):

<b>"p. 11 in Landgrebe"</b>
-----------------------------

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

empirically can be expected; rather, it sets forth the necessary system of structures without which it is not possible to think a synthesis of manifold perceptions as perceptions of one and the same thing. Among<sup>39</sup> the most important of the psychological-phenomenological syntheses to be explored are the syntheses of confirmation, for example, the way that, in external perception, consciousness -- in the form of agreement and via the fulfillment of anticipatory pre-grasps -- appropriates to itself evidential belief in the being [of something], and does so as a consciousness of the self-showing thing itself. Correlatively: there is the exploration of modalizations, doubtfulness, mere likelihood, and perhaps evident nullity as counterforms of the syntheses of agreement -- and so on for every kind of act (a pure psychology of reason).

#### [Reduction to Pure Intersubjectivity]

5. The first phenomenological reduction, the one described above, is the egological reduction; and so too phenomenology in the first [p. 246] instance is the phenomenology of the essential possibilities only of my own originally intuitive ego (egological phenomenology). However, a phenomenology of empathy and of the way empathy, as a synthesis of phenomena in my mind, can run its course with harmony and confirmation and can then, with consistent confirmation, indicate a "foreign subjectivity" -- all of that leads to the expansion of the phenomenological reduction into a reduction to pure intersubjectivity. There then arises, as purely psychological phenomenology in its completeness, the eidetic doctrine of a community constituted purely psychologically, in whose intersubjectively entwined acts (acts of community life) there is constituted the "objective" <p. 13> world (the world for everyone) as "objective" nature, as a world of culture and as a world of "objectively" existing communities.

---

<sup>39</sup>From this sentence to the end of the paragraph the text is bracketed in A1 and A2 (p. 12.5-14). In A1 it is marked with a deletion sign. In the left margin of A1 (cf. *Hu IX*, p. 245, n. 1) Heidegger writes:

**"Transcendental questions!"**

[The History of Phenomenological Psychology<sup>40</sup>

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

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

The first decisive impulse [in that direction] was given by Franz Brentano [p. 247] (Psychologie, I, 1874)<sup>41</sup> by means of his great discovery that

---

<sup>40</sup> *Hu* IX, p. 245.37-247.23. In all the later drafts, the material under this heading was combined with the material that comes in the next section (II. 1), and the combination was made into a single section that opens Part II. In Draft D that single section is §6, "Descartes' Transcendental Turn and Locke's Psychologism."

<sup>41</sup> [Translator's note: Franz Brentano, Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt, Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot, 2 volumes, 1874; second edition, ed. Oskar Kraus, Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 2 vols. 1924-1925, reprinted: Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1955. English translation: Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint, ed. Oskar Kraus, English edition by Linda L. McAlister, translated by Antos C. Rancurello, D. B. Terrell, and Linda L. McAlister, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Humanities Press, 1973.]

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

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

II.  
TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGY  
AS CONTRASTED WITH  
PSYCHOLOGICAL PHENOMENOLOGY

[The Historical Intertwining of Phenomenological and Transcendental Phenomenology,  
and the Need to Distinguish the Two<sup>42</sup> ]

1. The new phenomenology did not originally arise as pure psychology and thus was not born of a concern for establishing a radically scientific psychology;<sup>43</sup> rather, it arose as "transcendental phenomenology" with the purpose of reforming philosophy into a strict science. Because transcendental and psychological phenomenology have fundamentally different meanings, they must be kept most rigorously distinct. This is the case even though one science turns into the other through a mere change in focus, <p. 15> such that the "same" phenomena and eidetic insights occur in both sciences, [p. 248] albeit under a different rubric, so to speak, which changes their meaning fundamentally.

Even Locke's interest lay not primarily in establishing a pure psychology; rather, this was to be only the means to a universal solution of the problem of "understanding." Thus his primary theme was the enigma of the functions of understanding that are carried out as knowledge and science within subjectivity while making claims to objective validity. In short, Locke's Essay was intended as the projection of a theory of knowledge, a

---

<sup>42</sup> *Hu IX*, p. 247.24-249.4. The material under this heading generally corresponds to Draft D, §6, with intimations of §7 (the need to distinguish the transcendental and the psychological problematics; cf. pp. 248.15-28: Descartes' transcendental view) and §8 (the inadequacies of psychologism; cf. pp. 248.28-249.4: Locke's psychologism).

<sup>43</sup> Heidegger's (erased) marginal note (A1, p. 14.23; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 247, n. 1):

**"Rational psychology!"**

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

transcendental philosophy. He<sup>44</sup> and his school have been charged with "psychologism." But if the thrust of the transcendental problem is to interrogate the sense and the legitimacy of an objectivity that becomes consciously known in the immanence of pure subjectivity and that presumably is demonstrated within the subjective grounding-processes, then this question equally concerns anything and everything objective.

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

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

---

<sup>44</sup>This and the next sentence are joined within brackets in A2, p. 15.12-19. In the left margin there is a note in shorthand, possibly from Heidegger:

"Unusable."
-------------

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

belong to bodies in nature that are presupposed but simply left out of consideration. Like every positive science, this pure psychology<sup>45</sup> is itself transcendently problematic.

[The Transcendental Reduction and the Semblance of Doubling<sup>46</sup>]

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

Descartes had already touched upon this reduction insofar as (in keeping with his methodical principle of epoché with regard to everything that can possibly be doubted) he puts out of play the being of the whole world of experience; he already recognizes that what remains in play thereafter is the ego cogito as the universum of pure <p. 17> subjectivity and that this pure subjectivity -- which is not to be taken as the [empirical] I, "this man"<sup>47</sup> -- is the entity that is, in its immanent validity, presupposed by, and therefore has intrinsic priority over, all positive cognition. If to this we add Locke's momentous recognition of the necessity for describing cognitive life concretely in all its basic kinds and levels, plus Brentano's discovery of intentionality in its new utilization, plus finally the recognition of the necessity of a a priori method, then what results is the theme and method of present-day transcendental phenomenology. Instead of a reduction merely to

<sup>45</sup>Heidegger's note (A1, p. 16.17; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 249, n.1):

**"as empirical"**  
[underlined in the original]

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

<sup>46</sup>*Hu IX*, pp. 249.4-250.24. The material here generally corresponds to Draft D, § 9, from which we derive this title.

<sup>47</sup>Heidegger (A1, p. 17.2; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 249, n. 2) glosses "this man" with:

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

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

purely psychic subjectivity (the pure minds of human beings in the world), we get a reduction to transcendental subjectivity by means of a methodical epoché regarding the real world as such and even regarding all ideal objectivities as well (the "world" of number and such like). What remains in validity is exclusively the universum of "transcendentally pure" subjectivity and, enclosed within it, all the actual and possible "phenomena" of objectivities, all modes of appearance and modes of consciousness that pertain to such objectivities, and so forth.

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

2. All positive sciences are sciences [that function] in transcendental naïveté. Without realizing it, they do their research with a one-sided orientation in which the entire life that transcendently constitutes the real unities of experience and knowledge remains hidden to these sciences -- even though, as one can see clearly only after our reductions, all such unities, according to their own cognitional sense, are what they are only as unities of transcendently constituting multiplicities. Only transcendental phenomenology (and <p. 19> its transcendental idealism consists in nothing other than this) makes possible sciences that deal with the fully concrete, comprehensive sciences, which implies: sciences that thoroughly understand and justify themselves. The theme of transcendental phenomenology has to do with any and every possible subjectivity as such, in whose conscious life [p. 251] and constitutive experiences and cognitions a possible objective world comes to consciousness.

The world as experienced in factual experience is the theme of the fully thought-out system of the positive empirical sciences. But on the basis of a free ideal variation of factual experience in relation to its world of experience there arises the idea of possible experience in general as experience of a possible world, and consequently the idea of the possible system of experiential sciences as belonging a priori to the unity of a possible world. So, on the one hand there is an a priori ontology that systematically explores the structures that essentially and necessarily belong to a possible world, that is, everything without which a world as such could not be ontically thought. But on the other hand there is phenomenological correlation-research, which explores the possible world and its ontic structures (as a world of possible experience) with regard to the possible bestowal of sense and the establishment of being, without which that world equally could not be thought. In this way transcendental phenomenology, once

---

<sup>48</sup> *Hu IX*, p. 250.25--251.23. The material corresponds generally to Draft D, III, §11, from which we derive this title.

realized, encompasses a universal ontology in a broadened sense: a full, universal, and concrete ontology in which all correlative ontological concepts are drawn from a transcendental originality that leaves no questions of sense and legitimacy in any way unclarified.

[Phenomenology and the Crisis in Foundations of the Exact Sciences<sup>49</sup>]

<p. 20> The a priori sciences that have developed historically do not at all bring to realization the full idea of a positive ontology. They deal only (and in this regard, even incompletely) with the logical form of every possible world (formal mathesis universalis) and the eidetic form of a possible physical nature. They remain stuck in transcendental naïveté and consequently are burdened with those shortcomings in foundation-building that necessarily follow from it. In this naïve form they function as methodological instruments for the corresponding "exact" empirical sciences, or to put it more accurately, they serve: to rationalize the regions of empirical data; to supply a methexis between the factual and the necessary by means of a reference back to the eidetic structure of a possible world-fact in general; and thereby to provide a foundation of laws to undergird merely inductive rules. The "basic concepts" of all positive sciences -- those from out of which all concepts of worldly reality are built -- are at the same time the basic concepts of the corresponding rational sciences. [p. 252] If there is any lack of clarity as regards their origins, and consequently any failure regarding knowing their genuine and necessary sense, this lack of clarity gets transmitted to the whole theoretical make-up of the positive sciences. In most recent times the defectiveness of all positive sciences has been disclosed by the crisis of foundations into which all positive, empirical and a priori sciences have fallen, as well as by the battle over the "paradoxes," over the either genuine or merely apparent evidentiality of the traditional basic concepts and principles in arithmetic, chronology, and so forth. In light of

---

<sup>49</sup> *Hu IX*, p. 251.23--252.15. The material corresponds generally to Draft D, III, §12, from which we take this title.

the whole character of their method, the positive sciences can no longer be considered genuine sciences -- sciences that <p. 21> can completely understand and justify themselves and that can sketch out sure paths for themselves with comprehensive insight. Modern science can be liberated from this intolerable situation only by a phenomenological reform.

[The Phenomenological Grounding of the Factual Sciences<sup>50</sup> ]

According to what we said earlier, transcendental phenomenology is called upon to develop the idea, which it harbors within itself, of a universal ontology elevated to the transcendental level and thus brought to concrete comprehensiveness -- that is, the idea of a science of the system of eidetic forms of every possible world of cognition as such and of the correlative forms of their intentional constitution. Accordingly, phenomenology is the original locus of the basic concepts of all a priori sciences (as branches of the one ontology) and hence of all the corresponding empirical sciences of our factual world -- basic concepts that are to be formed in ordinary genuineness and that, as regards their phenomenological development, are, from the outset, free of any unclarity. As it unfolds systematically, this phenomenological ontology prepares all the as yet ungrounded a priori sciences and thus prepares for the development of all empirical sciences into "exact" (rationalized) sciences. An important step in that direction is the founding of an a priori pure psychology that functions for empirical psychology the way a priori geometry, etc., functions for empirical physics. This idea will necessarily determine the work of the next one hundred years.<sup>51</sup> A major task contained therein is the phenomenological interpretation of history and of the universal "sense" contained in its unrepeatability.

3. The phenomenology of emotional and volitional life with the intentionality proper to it, [which is] founded on the [p. 253] phenomenology

---

<sup>50</sup> *Hu IX*, p. 252.15--253.21. The material corresponds generally to that in Draft D, III, §13, from which we derive this title.

<sup>51</sup> This sentence is struck out in both A1 and A2, p. 21.23-24.

<p. 22> of natural experience and knowledge, encompasses the whole of culture according to its necessary and possible eidetic forms as well as the correlative a priori that belongs to the eidetic forms of sociality. Obviously every normative discipline and every philosophical discipline in the specialized sense belongs within the circle of phenomenology, just as, historically, philosophical phenomenology arose in connection with clarifying the idea of a pure logic, a formal axiology, and a theory of practice. Phenomenology is anti-metaphysical insofar as it rejects every metaphysics concerned with the construction of purely formal hypotheses.<sup>52</sup> But like all genuine philosophical problems, all metaphysical problems return to a phenomenological base, where they find their genuine transcendental form and method fashioned from intuition. Moreover, phenomenology is not at all a system-philosophy in the tradition style, but rather a science that works via systematic, concrete investigations. Even the lowest level -- the purely descriptive eidetic analysis of the structures of a transcendently pure subjectivity (of the ego as a monad) -- is already an immense field of concrete investigative work, whose results are basic for all philosophy (and psychology).

[The Phenomenological Resolution of All Philosophical Antitheses<sup>53</sup> ]

As the work of phenomenology advances systematically from intuitive data to abstract heights, the old traditional ambiguous antitheses of philosophical standpoints get resolved by themselves without the tricks of argumentative dialectics or feeble efforts at compromise -- antitheses such as those between

---

<sup>52</sup>Heidegger's note (A2, p. 22.10; cf. *Hu IX*, p. 253, n. 1):

"or: and all the more so insofar as one understands metaphysics as the presentation of a world-view that is performed in the natural attitude and that is always tailored only to the natural attitude in particular historical situations of life -- those of life's specifically factual cognitional possibilities."

["oder und erst recht sofern man unter Metaphysik die Darstellung eines Weltbildes versteht, das in der natürlichen Einstellung vollzogen und je nur auf sie in bestimmten historischen Situationen des Lebens -- seiner gerade faktischen Erkenntnismöglichkeiten -- zugeschnitten ist."]

<sup>53</sup>*Hu IX*, p. 253.21--254.38. The material corresponds generally to Draft D, III, §16, whence we take this title.

rationalism (Platonism) and empiricism, subjectivism and objectivism, idealism and realism, ontologism and transcendentalism, psychologism and anti-psychologism, positivism and metaphysics, between a teleological<sup>54</sup> conception of the world and a causalistic one. <p. 23> On both sides there are legitimate reasons, but also half-truths and inadmissible absolutizations of partial positions that are only relatively and abstractly justified. Subjectivism can be overcome only by the most universal and consistent subjectivism (transcendental subjectivism). In this form [p. 254] subjectivism is at the same time objectivism, insofar as it defends the rights of every objectivity that is to be demonstrated by harmonious experience, but indeed also brings to validity its full and genuine sense, against which the so-called realistic objectivism sins in its misunderstanding of transcendental constitution. Again it has to be said: Empiricism can [be overcome<sup>55</sup>] only by the most universal and consistent empiricism that, in place of the narrowed-down "experience" of the empiricists, posits the necessarily broadened concept of experience -- originally giving intuition -- that in all its forms (intuition of the eidōs, apodictic evidence, phenomenological intuition of essence, etc.) demonstrates the kind and form of its legitimation by means of phenomenological clarification. Phenomenology as eidetics, on the other hand, is rationalistic; it overcomes narrow, dogmatic rationalism by means of the most universal rationalism, that of eidetic research related in a unified way to transcendental subjectivity, ego-consciousness and conscious objectivity. The same goes for the other mutually intertwined antitheses. Within its doctrine of genesis, phenomenology treats the eidetic doctrine of association: it purifies and justifies Hume's preliminary discoveries but then goes on to show that the essence of transcendental subjectivity as well as its system of eidetic laws are thoroughly teleological. Phenomenology's transcendental idealism harbors natural realism entirely within itself, but it proves itself not by aporetic argumentation but by the consistency of phenomenological work itself. Phenomenology joins ranks with Kant in the

---

<sup>54</sup>In *Hu IX*, p. 253.31, this word, teleologischer, is misprinted as theologischer.

<sup>55</sup>The bracketed words are supplied by Biemel: *Hu IX*, p. 254.7-8.

battle against the shallow ontologism of concept-analysis, but it is itself an ontology, albeit one drawn from transcendental "experience." Phenomenology repudiates every philosophical "renaissance"; as a philosophy of self-reflection at its most original and its most universal, it is directed to concepts, problems and insights <p. 24><sup>56</sup> that one achieves by oneself, and yet it does get stimulation from the great men and women of the past, whose earlier intuitions it corroborates while transposing them to the firm ground of concrete research that one can take up and carry through. It demands of the phenomenologist that he or she personally renounce the ideal of a philosophy that would be only one's own and, instead, as a modest worker in a community with others, live for a philosophia perennis.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>Pp. 24-25 of A2 were removed by Husserl and are found appended to the end of Christopher V. Salmon's first draft of the condensed translation.

<sup>57</sup>This last sentence is taken over virtually verbatim as the last sentence of Draft C, p. 45.15-18 and (since this p. 45 was imported, renumbered, into Draft D) of Draft D, p. 31.15-18.

LITERATURE<sup>58</sup>

1. GENERAL ISSUES AND BASIC WORKS

The organ of the phenomenological movement:

Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung, eds., E. Husserl and others<sup>59</sup>, Halle 1913 ff., eight volumes up to now. (Hereafter abbreviated: Jb.)

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

\_\_\_\_\_,  
"Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft," Logos, vol. I, 1913.

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

M. Scheler,  
Abhandlungen und Aufsätze, Leipzig, 1915, in a newer edition under the title Vom Umsturz der Werte, 1918.

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Die Wissensformen und die Gesellschaft, Leipzig, 1926.

A. Reinach,  
Gesammelte Schriften, Halle, 1922.

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

O. Mahnke,  
"Eine neue Monadologie," Kantstudien, Supplementary vol. 39, 1917.<sup>60</sup>

Philosophische Anzeiger, Bonn, 1925 ff.  
In large measure oriented along phenomenological lines.

Chr. Salmon,  
Hume's Philosophy (in English)<sup>61</sup>

2. LOGIC AND FORMAL ONTOLOGY

<sup>58</sup>Heidegger's note (A2, p. 24.8; cf. *Hu* IX, p. 597):

"Dates" [Jahreszahlen].

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

<sup>59</sup>For a brief history of the *Jahrbuch* see Karl Schuhmann, "Husserl's Yearbook," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 50, Supplement (Fall 1990), 1-25.

<sup>60</sup>Following the Mahnke entry, there is typed in and then crossed out: "W. Reyer. Einführung in die Phänomenologie, Leipzig 1926."

<sup>61</sup>This entry refers to the dissertation that Christopher V. Salmon had written under Husserl's direction and defended in the summer of 1927. It was published late in 1928 as: "The Central Problem of Hume's Philosophy: A Phenomenological Interpretation of the *Treatise on Human Nature*" in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* IX (1928), 299-449.

- A. Pfänder,  
Logik, Halle, 1921 (= Jb. IV).
- M. Heidegger,  
Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus, Tübingen, 1916.
- R. Ingarden,  
"Essenziale Fragen," Jb. VII, 1925.

### 3. PSYCHOLOGY

- A. Pfänder,  
"Psychologie der Gesinnungen," Jb. I, 1913.
- W. Schapp,  
Beiträge zur Phänomenologie der Wahrnehmung, Halle, 1910.

### 4. ETHICS

- M. Scheler,  
Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik, 1913f. (= Jb. I, II).

### 5. AESTHETICS

- M. Geiger,  
Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses, Halle, 1913.
- R. Odebrecht,  
Grundlegung einer ästhetischen Werttheorie, Berlin, 1927.

### 6. PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE

- O. Becker,  
"Beiträge zur phänom[enologischen] Begründung der Geometrie," Jb. VI, 1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
Mathematische Existenz, Halle, 1927 (= Jb. VIII).

- H. Conrad-Martius,  
"Realontologie, I," Jb. VI, 1922/23.

### 7. PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

- M. Scheler,  
Vom Ewigen im Menschen, Leipzig, 1921.
- K. Stavenhagen,  
Absolute Stellungnahmen, Erlangen, 1925.
- Jean Héring,  
Phénoménologie et philosophie religieuse, Strasbourg, 1925.

<sup>62</sup>In the margin next to the Scheler entry Husserl wrote: "D. v. Hildebrand," i.e., Dietrich von Hildebrand.

<p. 25>

8. PHILOSOPHY OF LAW; SOCIOLOGY

- A. Reinach,  
Die apriorischen Grundlagen des bürgerlichen Rechts, Jb. I, 1913.
- F. Kaufmann,  
Logik und Rechtswissenschaft, Tübingen, 1922.
- F. Schreier,  
Grundbegriffe und Grundformen des Rechts, Vienna, 1924.
- Gerh. Husserl,  
Rechtskraft und Rechtsgeltung, I., Berlin, 1925.
- M. Scheler,  
Wesen und Formen der Sympathie, Bonn, 1923.
- Th. Litt,  
Individuum und Gemeinschaft, Leipzig, 1924.
- E. Stein,  
Eine Untersuchung über den Staat, Jb. VII, 1925.