Husserl Studies **20**: 135–159, 2004.

Review essay

Edmund Husserl, *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis. Lectures on Transcendental Logic*, Anthony J. Steinbock, trans. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001 (Series Edmund Husserl Collected Works, Vol. 9), lxviii + 659 pp. ISBN 0-7923-7065, US$ 270.00 (hb); ISBN 0-7923-7066x, US$91.00, Euro 290, GB£183 (pb).

1. Introduction

Anthony Steinbock's very readable translation gives English readers the opportunity to become acquainted with important lectures on transcendental logic given between 1920 and 1926. The central lectures and the greater portion of this massive volume are from Hua XI, *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis*, first published in 1966. Because these lectures are tied so clearly to Husserl's published masterpiece, *Formal and Transcendental Logic* (1929), as well as to the texts that Ludwig Landgrebe put together as *Experience and Judgment* (first edition, 1939),[1] Steinbock has placed at the beginning a lecture Husserl gave that introduces the students to the lectures of transcendental logic. Parts of this Introduction served as the basis for Husserl's own introduction to *Formal and Transcendental Logic*. Inserting this rich text, which first appeared as a supplement in Hua XVII, 351–378, is a felicitous decision by Steinbock and the editors at the Husserl Archives.

In these lectures we get a clear sense of the archaeology of logic and phenomenologists would expect, probably in vain, that this volume would give Husserl a seat at the table where current Anglo-American discussions of rationality, cognitive science, propositional form, etc. are taking place. Because in this volume Husserl deals with proto-rationality, i.e., the elemental adumbrations of propositional form, syntax, etc., prior to sentences, and even language, we have to do not only with the foundations of logic but also with philosophical anthropology and psychology, and even, as we shall see, philosophical theology.

Another good decision on the part of the translator was to supplement the translation of Hua XI with the newly (2000) published Hua XXXI, *Aktive Synthesis: Aus der Vorlesung "Transzendentale Logik" 1920–1921,* edited by Roland Breeur and published as an *Ergänzungband zu Analysen zur passiven Synthesis)*. Although much of Hua XI at least implicitly has to do

with "active synthesis" Steinbock's inclusion of Hua XXXI as Part 3 accounts for Steinbock's choice for the title of this volume, *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis*.

A bonus of this book is some footnotes. Here Steinbock's queries to the Husserl Archives regarding some of the transcriptions in the original critical edition of Hua XI have resulted in corrections. Furthermore, Steinbock's own Introduction and footnotes are often very helpful and nicely elucidate some of the themes of this rich but often difficult volume. The reader may be advised that because the transitions to the major parts of this book were not originally designed for precisely this function but rather are the result of Steinbock's decision to place the works together, they are not smooth. Nevertheless in spite of the bumps at the junctures, the joining of the works is clearly justified.

Although this book is sumptuous in philosophical detail, and although its rich ore has scarcely been mined, and although it is expensive by most standards, by way of contrast, it, as a thing in the world, is somewhat penurious in appearance. For example, running along the spine one finds, against the large black background, *in the size of ordinary font*, the typed capital gold letters: EDMUND HUSSERL COLLECTED WORKS IX KLUWER. Regrettably in my copy the cover is upside down and therefore there is no lettering on the cover!

2. Perception and Philosophical Interest in Sense

In his "Translator's Introduction" (XVII–XXV) Steinbock nicely lays out the gist of the relation of transcendental logic and passive synthesis. This involves initially a summary of Part 1's discussion of "logos" in its most elemental forms in the stream of consciousness and how this is transformed under the sway of a telological animation into logic and science and the science of sciences. Steinbock retraces the crisis of self-forgetfulness in this development where the original sense of self-justification gets lost in a kind of positivism of theorems, theories, axioms, postulates, etc. Husserl, in an Aristotelian register, says that even if it historically were the case that the outlines of the positive sciences and of a positive or theoretical logic have developed first, phenomenology forms what is "first in itself out of which all fundamental forms of logical structures must proceed in a general manner." (pp. 7–8)

In the introductory Part 1 Husserl also takes up very briefly the theme that preoccupied him in the reworking of the sixth of the *Logical Investigations* (see Hua XX/I recently published by Ullrich Melle), namely, the relationship between language and thoughtfulness. Although this theme is not explicitly dealt with in these lectures on passive and active synthesis, there are some striking formulations of the issues in Part 1 that have to deal not only with the relation of thinking and language but also, and quite surreptitiously, with the

transcendental reduction. But it must be said that the lecture has some ambiguities and Husserl himself noted that the lecture was "unfortunately reworked" in its second presentation in 1923 (Hua XVII, 469). One reason, perhaps, for this complaint is the way the text shows or fails to show the various layers of "sense-constitution." The drift of the text is to show how even at the levels of passive synthesis in our pre- or non-linguistic, non-verbal, wakeful perception and observation of something there are the seeds of sense-formation that eventually become the fruits that are harvested in formal logic. Most readers familiar with Husserl will take this thesis, advanced in Part 1 towards the end, for granted. Therefore they will be surprised to find Husserl saying that we "have arrived at the insight that neither any kind of intentional lived experience, nor even any kind of act can be found in the sense-constituting function, neither with respect to signs in general, nor accordingly with respect to speaking." (p. 24) The German reads: "*Wir sind also zur Einsicht gekommen, dass nicht beliebige intentionale Erlebnissse and auch nicht beliebige Akte in der Sinn konstituierenden Funktion stehen können, nicht bei Zeichen im allgemeinen and somit auch nicht bei Reden.*" (Hua XVII, 367) I would thus translate it as: "not merely whatever kind of intentional lived-experiences [or simply: experiences; see below] nor whatever kind of act can be found in the sense-constituting function." The advantage to this translation is greater justice is rendered to *beliebige*, and the undesirable implication is weakened that no kind of act that involves signs or speaking can be found in the "sense-constituting function."

Although these pages, 22–35, are very important, Husserl's unfolding of the issues is not clear. I think, however, the basic thesis is that there is a unique kind of sense-giving in thoughtful speech that builds on the current experience of "wanting to say what I mean" (p. 24), even when I experience myself as fluent and so eloquent that the words come on their own (p. 22). In the linguistic achievement pursuant to saying what one means there is a sense of "sense-constitution" by me myself in which sense itself is manifest in a way it is not in prelinguistic sense-constitution. The sense-constitution in linguistic achievements, in contrast to that in merely seeing, wishing, regretting, etc. involves that I say what I see, say what I wish, express my regrets, etc. There is a different presencing of sense in saying that the bird is perched on the limb than in seeing the bird perched on the limb. The thematization of sense as such, of course, is not yet achieved in mere seeing. But in the stating of the state of affairs, the syntax is available for reflection in a way it was not in the mere seeing. Husserl regards this articulating thinking as the "general character of a thematically intending act," "the realm of thinking as the sense-giving function peculiar to statements." The philosophical mode of interest in sense is potentially alive in speaking in a way it isn't prior to speaking.

Whereas the conclusion of Part 1 as well as the great part of Part 2 strive to "liberate the concept of sense from its relation to expressions" where "the ego

carries out acts thematically and becomes a subject of thematic interest" and strives to enter into the realm of greater generality of sense-giving, i.e., that of passive synthesis, nevertheless the earlier sections of Part I deal with the waking I's articulation of life and the world in thoughtful speech. One reason why this is paramount is Husserl's position (Hua XX/I, 70) that the perceptual "syntax" or judgment has an essential relationship to the meaning (verbally understood: *Bedeuten*) of the statement; the statement is an expression of this meaning to say and yet it is not as if the meaning were in fact full-blown apart from the language.[2] Speaking in the sense of finding the right word fills in the empty intention of the pre-linguistic meaning act that, prior to the presence of the word, is there, "known" but darkly; but this dark empty intention is not a wordless medium; saying what we mean is always also finding the right word (see XX/I, 86ff.). Even though this theme, and especially its connection to the topic of association, is not explicit in this volume, it is of great importance to the philosophical problems of this book. As Husserl says, "Only acts in the mode of thematic acts, acts of interest in a definite sense, can function in such a way; only acts through which what is given to consciousness in them has for the ego the preferential character of thematic intending." (p. 24) "What I state, what I express in speaking is my theme, my 'what I intend' in the moment of my current speaking." (p. 24)

Of course, Husserl is at pains to say that in this kind of sense-constitution language (signs, expression, etc.) is not itself intended as an object. Rather what I mean is intended. Yet there is a constitution of sense that is organized according to the constitution of the word *and* sense (p. 25), i.e., an act of reference (*Hinweisung*) that "assigns to the different acts of meaning and word simultaneously a different place and function" in the synthetic achievement of "meaning to say" (pp. 24–25). Saying what one means is not only the *telos* of the pre-linguistic perceiving but it raises sense to a possible level of interest that is missing at the pre-linguistic level. I think the best work done on this to date is Robert Sokolowski's uncovering of the unique kind of presencing in *naming* where the beginning speaker and listener is able to appreciate something while being indifferent to its presence or absence.[3] This is implicit in Husserl's notion of the ideality of language; it is also part of what he means in this Introduction as "thematic acts" where the meaning to say as well as the said puts us in the presence of something regardless of its being present or absent, and enables a thematization of this kind of presencing which is not possible when absorbed in the absence or presence of the matter at hand.

The greater part of this book brings to light through thoughtful speech or articulate thinking the hidden bases of such thoughtful speech in the hidden *logos* of the flow of wakeful consciousness in its perceiving and observing life. It is not that there is no *logos*, no articulation, no syntax in the sense of no positing, no conjoining, no negating, no actuality, no possibility, no modalization, etc. prior to language and prior to explicit egological position-

taking, which has its exemplary form in my attempt to say what I mean and say what I do. Husserl's great achievement here is to bring to light the *logos* prior to speech and position-taking, the syntax prior to sentences, the odd because feeble and seminal articulation prior to linguistic achievement. This is all quite amazing (for Husserl's use of *wunderbar* and its cognates see, e.g., pp. 50, 146, 148, 265, 267, 596–597, 600, 604). Particularly amazing is how a perceptual "judgment" like (to put what happens without language into words) "There is a shopper standing next to me looking at the wares" becomes modified into "But 'she' is a mannequin" and how this in turn has a retroactive effect of modalization on the prior certainties that comes to light in our present recalling those earlier unmodalized perceptions: They now exist for us as themselves having been modalized. And all of this has run its course on its own apart from any egological intervention or linguistic articulation (pp. 69, 84).

The coming to be of the explicitly articulate out of the "pre-articulate" is one of the senses of genetic phenomenology that is a theme in this book. In this bringing to light of the levels of theme, articulation, sense, etc. it is sometimes required that we have a closer look at the world at our disposal prior to this bringing to light; but sometimes, as in the example of the retrospective modalization that radiates back on the prior "certainties" we have something like a quasi-Kantian postulation of the conditions of the possibility of what unfolds before or eyes or prior to our reflective gaze brings it to light. (Cf. also 602.)

Perhaps this theme of the proper sense of thinking as thoughtful speech or dialogue with oneself or others, accounts for Husserl's life-long *modus vivendi*, i.e., his doing philosophy by *writing* for twelve hours per day. Writing is a condition for Husserl's phenomenologizing, i.e., sense-filled reflection. By this form of speaking to and with himself the thematization of sense can be a matter of "interest" in a way it is not if he were to be merely reflectively observing; and its establishment as writing provided something to which he and others could return as the same and rework, reject or assume.

Reading good philosophy comprehendingly, like listening with comprehension, is a second-hand participation in an original first-person achievement of disclosure; reading and listening are achievements of I-acts in the wake of another's initiative, lead and freedom (p. 22). But even the original initiator, who probably is also a reader and listener, is in a securer position to claim to know where he is going and where he has been if his reflections have found expression.

2. A Theme in Part 2: Fulfillment as the Mind's Telos

Part 2 is an effort by Husserl to capture the "sense and accomplishment of that life of consciousness that is completely hidden from us *because* it is our liv-

ing life" (p. 450). The context makes clear that "life" here is elemental and primordial, and as such the source of objectivating consciousness. Hume and other British Empiricists are overheard in much of this presentation in as much as it presupposes a technique of dismantling, shutting down, or putting out of play of our normal and adult wakeful apperceptions. Throughout Husserl assumes the reader/listener has taken up the attitude of the transcendental reduction; but he here wishes to get at the basic elements of constitution where "original association" and synthesis prevail, where we live

> as if the world of the ego were only the impressional present and as if the transcending apperceptions arising from further reaching subjective lawful regularities did not play any role at all, as if there were no modes of knowledge acquired in the life of the world, aesthetic and practical interests, values, and the like. (p. 198).

See also pp. 174–175 and p. 205, where Husserl incidentally mentions that this is a study in the eidetic attitude.

The primary focus is "original association" and much of Husserl's teaching is placed in the new key of "affection." Because "affection" assumes central stage, the original living present or the impressional present's primal process is the equivalent of *das Gemüt* or "the heart," initially studied as if bereft of all apperceptions, habits, acquired valuations, "interests in the broad, customary sense," etc. In such a shut-down attitude "affection," like its philosophical cognate, "impression," enfolds both what affects (impresses) and the being affected (impressed). That which affects must have already "got through" or made a dent on the I's awareness; it must have caught its attention or be attended to. Steinbock in his Introduction calls attention to the realistic language of the object radiating or emitting an allure (Steinbock's nice translation of *Reiz*) toward consciousness. This seems especially apt in regard to the example of an explosion that intrudes upon our attention. Yet it is clear that the very effectiveness of the allure means that the I is affected, has an affection. There is no allure without the I being affected and this is a prelude to the elemental "intention" or turning towards. Thus we seem to have things affecting or emitting an affection which in turn awakens the interest or the attention, which awakening itself is a moment of passivity or receptivity, or perhaps delight, and this in turn becomes a moment in the passive or active taking notice. At this radically dismantled level we are dealing with the most elemental sense of perception, awareness, noticing, etc., like, while strolling on a hill in the dark, being affected by a string of lights suddenly flashing below (p. 202). Here elemental senses of prominence, foreground, homogeneity, sameness, contrast, whole-part, individuation in space and time are brought to light as forms of order or arrangement within the perceptual field even apart from the I's taking an active interest. These elemental forms adumbrate the higher-order ontological thematic forms or categories of *eidos*, predica-

tion, individuation, etc. Husserl's preferred example is how these elemental forms emergent within the, e.g., visual sense field, give rise to the formalities of geometry, as figure, line, point, distance, segment, direction, size, etc. (p. 193).

As Husserl here and often elsewhere notes, we find that in the syntheses of original time-consciousness there is created the original field of presence by our simply being awake. This field of presence rooted in the original ongoing of retention of what was just now and the protention of not-yet now is the original synthesis and comprises the "A" of the ABC's of the constitution of all objectivity that becomes conscious as well as the existing for itself of subjectivity (pp. 170–171).

The original syntheses of the primal impression are the original vitality of the heart, understood in its most elemental abstract and de-worlded form. Husserl chooses here the language of the heart (*Gemüt, Anmut, Vermuten,* affection (pp. 82, 298, 198, 214ff., 224, 227), something being "important" by way of being importunate or having weight (*Gewicht*) or tugging at our attention. Although Husserl's terminology is somewhat loose, the primal impression or living present, in a necessarily equivocal sense, "I myself" as the ultimate founding consideration, is used for the core consideration bereft of apperceptions, associations, habits, etc. The "heart" is the primal impression thickened out with attachments, affections, etc., even though here, for the most part, there is a dismantling of this thickness. Although the philosophical task is primarily the realm of cognitive awareness, Husserl believes that when we get back to the original generation by the primal impression and its syntheses of the original wakeful field of presence we best use the language of the heart in a way that what is referred to is prior to both cognition and volition. Here the use of the language of the heart, primarily that of "affection," does not refer to the higher-order sense of feeling and emotion, passion or volition; nor does it preclude the capacities that higher-order cognitive achievements manifest. Husserl makes clear that it is unsuitable to interpret his account of the living present or "heart" bereft of its apperceptions as a statement for the primacy of feeling or that we are to conceive "affection" in terms of an emotion. He even shies away from calling this elemental striving "desire" or "will" because these are properly higher-order activities. See pp. 280–283. These caveats are well-aimed yet Husserl himself mentions that "what I have said here is completely unsatisfactory" and this perhaps refers to his deep conviction of a universal voluntarism and his teleological understanding of the drift of the mind at all its levels. (For a rich statement, see Hua XV, Nr. 22.)

The preference for the language of the heart surfaces also when he, after a discussion of the modalization of an elemental belief or a positing, is moved to consider in what sense there is even in the passive-synthetic sphere the adumbration of the full-blown cognitive activities of questioning, doubting, judging, etc. He then asserts that all reason is at the same time practical reason and that rational judicative life is a medium for a peculiar or proper

(*eigentümliches*) kind of wishing, striving, will, acting – which themselves aim at truth through judgments! (See p. 103.)

This rich theory of the interplay of volition and cognition enables Husserl to hold that questioning itself belongs to the sphere of will (p. 103). But, at the same elemental stage, will here does not refer to the egological act of deciding, a *fiat*, but to a prior more basic sense of striving, meaning (verbally understood: *Meinen*), intending, being directed. That is the restlessness of the heart in its essential tendentiousness, i.e., its striving toward the filling of empty intentions until it rests in "the object itself." And in as much as this "object itself" in its filled presentation opens up endlessly new horizons, and therefore empty intentions, and in as much as protentions establish "the heart" in the not-yet, and in as much as there develops a total intention of the world (see below) there is a fundamental dissatisfaction and restlessness characterizing the heart. And this restlessness persists even when one is asleep (p. 129). (See §§ 20–21 of Part 2.) "Every momentary phase of perception is in itself a network of partially full and partially empty intentions."

A situation or a process extending further on in time, like a symphony, appears intuitively, but upon closer inspection only elements of the situation, small segments of the symphony, are genuinely self-given, even though we do "mean" or "intend" the whole. Thus even here we have a merely appresented outer horizon (p. 253).

Thus not only the higher-order life of perception but the life of "the heart" considered in this shut-down abstract way "is in a constant pretention to accomplish something that, by its very nature, it is not in a position to accomplish" (p. 39).

> No final presentation in the flesh is ever reached in the mode of appearance as if it would present the complete, exhausted self of the object. Every appearance implies a *plus ultra* in the empty horizon. And since every perception does indeed pretend to give the object [completely] in the flesh in every appearance, it in fact and by its very nature constantly pretends to accomplish more than it can accomplish (p. 48).

Thus life is lived toward the prospect, the *limes*, of an Itself that is without any unfilled intentions awaiting satisfaction. This is the norm of all approximation; it lives toward the complete rendering in the flesh of what in essence, even for the divine, remains soaked with absence, indetermination and a *plus ultra* (pp. 58, 56; see *Ideas I*, §41). This becomes *a fortiori* true when the Itself is the "world." (See 142 ff.)

Husserl treats us to important nuances in this theme of universal striving when we hear how the "intentionality" of retention itself is not a directedness ahead toward an object (116 ff.). In this sense retentions do not have an intentional character (p. 120) even though at least part of what is retained (acts) can well be intentional, i.e., directed toward an object.

3. Genetic Phenomenology and the Heart

The basic theme of this book, how higher-order achievements, e.g., propositions about the world that are founded in higher-order achievements themselves may be traced back to elemental achievements of primal impression's process or the "heart" and its affections, is a theory of the coming to be of apperceptions. This puts the philosopher in a position to behold the genesis of the world rooted in the original synthesis of time-consciousness. (Of course this is an eidetic display; see the rich text on p. 173, ll. 23 ff.) We have here a display of the stream of consciousness as not merely a succession, not merely the flow of ingredients after one another, but the stream as a development, as a production of ingredients out of one another (pp. 628–634). Although this production "out of one another" leads Husserl to speak of the life of consciousness as a kind of self-objectification (e.g., p. 262) clearly much depends on distinguishing the various ways in which association occurs. Clearly categorial intuition is not possible without the primal impression's being affected and its being affected itself awakening associations; yet the sense of "self-objectification" must leave room for the theme of (albeit constituted) transcendence that we normally associate with Husserl's view of apperception.

Static phenomenology regards the apperceptions as already finished even though it will study the relations of wholes and parts, founding and founded, etc. within the actual "completed" layers comprising apperceptions. Genetic phenomenology studies the "history" (the scare-quotes are required because we are always dealing with eidetic connections) of the coming to be of these "finished" layers of apperceptions out of the prior and more elemental achievements. Of course, this too is a study of founding and founded, wholes and parts and essential matters as well. (See, e.g., p. 204 where the affection of a whole is shown to arise from that of its parts and where ultimately the parts of these parts/wholes themselves eventually would have to be regarded as original wholes in order that parts of wholes may given at all.)

Hussserl uses the theory of association to account for how the elemental striving within the primal impression takes on the thickness of a meaning-giving act by which an identity in a manifold is established. Primal association itself is a way the primal impression becomes thick with meaning that spills over the present and includes relevant former experiences. Relevance has to do with the vivacity of the former experiences in the present. This vivacity depends very much on the motives lying in the living present. Seeing a *this* as X, i.e., recognizing, grasping it meaningfully, means the primal impression's elemental striving has an excess beyond what is immediately given to it now and here. Not seeing *this* as X means that for whatever reason one's retentional horizons do not respond to the present's evocation or allure in the same way, and therefore the protentional and expectational horizons are different too. "Apperception" is making sense of what is given in the primal

impression's immediate field of presence. Already the first original association of retention gives to the immediately present an excess of "meaning." Building on this is the way what is actually present awakens or calls forth the relevant horizons of experience and sense-making. Thus apperception is an awareness of what is not itself given but which intends what is given "as a motivation for a consciousness of something else." (p. 627)

The sphere of the living present or what the primal impression presences may be viewed as a whole that is an affective unity with "a unified vivacity into which all special affections that belong to the affective unity are integrated as moments, as moments that are unified." (See p. 216; for the final effort to make a complete philosophical statement founded in this most basic Husserlian consideration, see the final text in Hua XV.) The lines of affection and affective awakening lie in the primordial impression, but also the lines of "maintenance or propagation of affectivity procede from there" (p. 216). As a rule, what is given now in the flesh exercises the most allure. As this datum recedes into the background it loses in vivacity. Hand in hand with the emergence of a new primordial impression, the former retained impression undergoes a transformation, usually a loss in vivacity. Husserl maintains that to a point the affective force of this retained datum or experience is maintained but its allure is diminished (p. 217). Eventually the retained experience loses actual allure and becomes completely contentless and empty yet oddly "identical" in the identifying, synthesizing, ongoing process. It has still a kind of temporal place in the ongoing synthesis but its "content' is completely empty. It, like the primal I, is individual even though without content. (See below.)

There are various ways the primal present gets thickened through association (see e.g., 230 ff.). Of course, the most basic primordial association is the way the retention informs the sense of what the primal impression presences. But Husserl speaks of the "rubric of primordial association" (p. 230; cf. also 198 ff.) for also the "proper formation of unity of manifolds," i.e., the awakening of an attentiveness, a grasping, a knowing of something. This would seem also to be a recognizing of something. That is not only taking S as X but recognizing *this* S as X. Here there is no question of an intentional radiating back but rather of the automatic informing or thickening of what is given with an excess (*Überschuss*) beyond what is actually immediately given in the primal impression. There is a second level where the temporal horizon of what is before us, whether actually in perception or through some other mode of presentation, e.g., a picturing, an imagining, or even a remembering is brought to light. Here the dark empty horizon of retentions, what he calls the zero sphere (see below), are brought into relief. These are not yet necessarily turned to and re-presented. The third is the actual reproductive intentionality where the mind is directed in memory to what in fact was once actually presented. (See p. 230). And, of course, such reproductions can generate further reproductions: In recalling *X* I was reminded of *Y*; And *Y* might well remind me of *Z*, etc.

Key to Husserl's theory is that the otherwise unintelligible traditional "laws of association" of similarity, contiguity, and contrast gain intelligibility through the notion that in the living present there remains a bond with what has passed out of the field of presence. Because the retentions remain empty intentions within the living present (see p. 231), and because the living present is pervaded by a striving for total synthesis and the total intention of the world-life (see the excellent discussion, 142 ff), Husserl thinks of the thus thickened living present as *das Gemüt*. Absolutely central to this is the "heart's" cultivation and sedimentation because these determine the hierarchy of affections, i.e., what "kicks in," what "affects," what "can get through," and what gets awakened. The heart's affections or allegiances resemble what William Faulkner means by "memory's believing" when he says: "Memory believes before knowing remembers. Believes longer than recollects, longer than knowing even wonders."[4] In Husserl's words:

> it is all the same whether we conceive empty presentations (empty intentions) that are still living as being awakened or ones that are already fast asleep. The motives must lie in the living present where perhaps the most efficacious of such motives were such that we were not in a position [at the time] to take into consideration, i.e., "interests" in the broad, customary sense, original or already acquired valuations of the heart (*Gemüt*), instinctive or even higher drives, etc. (pp. 227–228, translation slightly modified).

This concise text, amplified at pp. 198, 214ff., 224 – (which is preceded by an intriguing, phenomenological thesis reminiscent of the Mahayana Buddhist theory of Alaya or storehouse consciousness) – provides an account of the quite anomalous experiences of nostalgia (cf. Proust) or the religious-aesthetic moments of "gathering" on which Scheler and Heidegger dwelled.[5]

4. "The Unconscious"

Another topic in this book is "the unconscious." As Steinbock says in his Introduction, "the unconscious is the nil of the vivacity of consciousness. . . a nothing of affective force that has arisen from original constitution, a nothing with respect to those accomplishments that presuppose an affectivity above the zero-point" (l). But these can still be reawakened because the sense that has been constituted itself still has connections with some layer of the "heart." These discussions by Husserl have generated many intriguing comparisons with psychoanalytic positions. Crucial here is the sense in which the ongoing passive synthesis of "habitualities" is "given"; and in what sense the synthesizing and teleology themselves are conscious. One might say that what is given is not evidently connected to the eventuating associated that comes forth, or to the sudden insight that I have, or the sudden decision that "I" make. For

example, yesterday I made a promise, and suddenly today I am reminded of it by something that occasions the recollection. In the meantime there was not "given" any continuous connection to the promise.[6] Or was there?

Husserl's account of retention and the primary phenomenon of the syntheses occurring in primal presencing as a process of elapsing, retaining and protending seems designed to point to a horizonal consciousness (co-givenness) of the "unconscious" connection. Or is it a Kantian account, in the sense of stating the non-given conditions for the possibility of such an association occurring? Surely retention is the beginning account of the most original having and habitualities. And this is the source of the most original pre-reflectively lived "I can." Yet at a certain time (T_1) the sense of I-can may well embrace a horizon of possibilties so that *A* can recall *B*; and *B* here is clearly lived in its being called forth as the same as what before was merely in the I-can. But is it the case always, e.g., at T_5, such as to give a lived sense of continuity of disposition or capacity so that *X* can call forth *Y* and I sense a continuity of I-can between *B* and *Y*; or does the I-can of *Y* at T_5 simply emerge and not at all as evidently continuous with the horizon embracing B and therefore we postulate (deduce) the continuity as a condition for the possibility of there being the sustained constant horizon? In which case I, in presencing *Y*, would experience it as continuous with my present I-can but would not experience it as continuous with the I-can that enabled the presencing of *B*. In which case I would postulate the continuity but it would not be a phenomenological explication.

A similar question may be raised in regard to "the phenomenon" of the synthesizing which accounts for the unity, connectedness, and harmonizing of the stream. Let us grant that unity and harmony are present as regulative ideas, analogous to the way the "idea of the thing" functions as a regulative idea. But how is the effective actual unify*ing* present? Let us grant that primal presencing's synthesizing of the just past is "given." And let us grant that we experience the filling intentions as a filling of the empty intentions, even as the empty intention of the total intention of the world (see below). But is the achievement of the unify*ing*, contextualiz*ing* (e.g., of the ever further elapsing retentions) and harmoniz*ing* (towards an every more satisfactory and consistent articulation of one's life in the world) "given" in any experience? Or is this achievement not "given" in the sense of something objective but manifest, all together, as a unique first-person non-intentional sense of oneself as both passive synthesis, a drive towards unity, and agent intellect? Or is it not given or manifest at all but "deduced" as a condition for the possibility of the evident results, i.e., of unity, context, and harmony? Presumably for Husserl the density and thickness of the I's non-objective self-experiencing is what enables that we avoid the Kantian deduction; it is what nullifies the temptation to posit an unconscious metaphysical self. But in what sense is his account of essential structures that are necessarily not objectively "given" able

to be corroborated phenomenologically? Even if we might conclude that no other account works as well we may ask: Is it generated by a phenomenological analysis? In short, is his account a categorial intuition or a transcendental deduction?

5. Active Synthesis

A key theme of Part 3 and also in Part 2 is the distinctive nature of active synthesis. There are already passive syntheses in our waking life prior to our explicit taking positions. On many occasions it is only the dubious state of affairs, where I am affected both by "this is a mannequin" and "this is a person," that I myself become actively engaged (Husserl usually says "the I" is engaged) to decide the issue.

Two considerations may be singled out from this massive topic. (1) The first is that Husserl maintains that there are indeed syntheses and "proto-" syntactical, modalizing achievements which happen "without us." The I is "*dabei*" but not engaged actively. The realm of the ongoing syntheses that go on without my doing anything, that themselves ride on the basis of the churning of so-called inner-time consciousness, are not an *It* existing apart from me but also me myself; yet *I* am not doing anything, not responsible. It is what I willy-nilly count on to make sense out of the world and what comprises the stuff of my agency; yet it is in some sense "there," *my* "primary sensibility" that, through sedimentations, character, etc., grows into a secondary sensibility (the language of Hua IV) which is both my grace and my karma. Therefore we have need of a distinction within the whole of the living present which is a necessarily equivocal sense of "I myself' that does justice to the basic features of the two parts. This duality in unity is a basic theme with which Husserl wrestled until the end of his life. In perhaps the latest discussion, in the *Nachlass* manuscript C 10, 15b the resolution is that the ultimate topic of transcendental phenomenology, the living present or equivocal transcendental "I," is a whole comprised of two moments, one of which is a primordial I that is actually or potentially active, affected, etc., and the other of which is primordial not-I as the hyletic stream of temporalization. We have another nice formulation in the Bernauer MSS, in Hua XXXIII, pp. 284–288. In this volume there are also some good wrestles with the topic (at pp. 94–99, 105, 261–262, 268–269, 313). (2) At pp. 94–95 Husserl speaks of the ongoing function of primary sensibility as "perception" that goes on by itself without the active comportment of the ego. The ego is affected by all this. Husserl claims that the I's primary motivation for active involvement in what "perception" automatically delivers up is "the restoration of perceptual concordance" that is interrupted by discordance. He describes the conflict emergent in "perception" as the I's being at variance with itself (p. 98). It is not the case that *It* is in

conflict or I am in conflict with *It*, but I am conflicted. Further, there are occasions for the I to appropriate what the realm of passive synthesis has delivered up. I can appropriate these achievements because they are also I myself, but incompletely and at a distance. When I do so there is a formation of the heart, an intellectual and moral character-building, personhood-shaping moment where I posit something as valid or as non-valid "from now on"; in so doing for the indefinite future the world has this articulation, analogous to a promise or resolve by which I determine my way of being in the world, "from now on" (pp. 94–97). In these acts I am at once nominative ("I") and accusative ("me"). These acts are self-reflexive, self-determining, "I-me acts" (Hua XIV, 370) in the sense that "I decide for myself" and in the deciding, in the judging I make up my mind, shape myself, become me as this person constituting itself in the world. (p. 93: the translation tries to capture the original "es entscheidet *sich*" with "it *makes* a decision.")

The position-taking is a way the spirit overcomes the ravages of time, securing idealities that hold from now on. Yet prior to the position-taking we were not simple wantons for whom there was no persisting sameness; but we did not ourselves appropriate and solidify these samenesses, establishing them as identical samenesses to which we can return as the same. Again, in the position-taking, we appropriate, make our own, what is us in a not yet actual way, but which is not an It, alien to us, existing apart from I myself.

If I were not to take a position, to appropriate actively the deliverances of passive synthesis, if I were to live only in passivity, I would be "intellectually blind to the true being of this sphere [of norms and laws]" (p. 262). At pp. 312–313 this theme returns under traditional rubrics: *Intellect* is a name for the achievement of objects that the I creatively gives to itself through activities of identification (and appropriation). *Sensibility* is the name for the constituting achievements without participation of the I. (For other references to "intellect" and "agent intellect" see pp. 105, 312, and 332.)

Another theme in Parts 2 and 3 of this volume is one that Iso Kern, in the most unread of all phenomenological classics,[7] has highlighted, i.e., the problematic character of the "identity syntheses" alleged at the passive synthetic level. Kern argues that at this level we more properly have "fusions," continuities, etc., not identities, and Husserl has surreptitiously introduced the achievements of intellect into the realm of sensibility. It is fascinating to read the analyses of this volume with Kern's critique in mind. Husserl surely would acknowledge that there is something very feeble (Sokolowski's term) about these syntheses, and that they are merely preparatory for the proper active syntheses, that an Itself (*Selbst*) that is present as truly identifiable and as what we can ever again return to, is only there through the active engagement of the I, exemplarily in remembering (see, e.g., p. 204). Indeed, Husserl admits that prior to all remembering and all active position-taking in regard to perception, we have unities in the process of becoming. But we here do not yet

have an "object" in the proper sense "whose cognition lies in the process of synthetic identification, which presupposes remembering." (p. 615) This is a rich debate and we can only refer to it here.[8]

Clearly for Husserl the foundations of the identities and idealities that permit the formations of sentences and the forms of propositions that in turn give birth to the formalizations of logic are to be found in the level of passive synthesis. Part 3 of this volume, *Active Synthesis*, summarizes these famous themes that we find in both *Formal and Transcendental Logic* and *Experience in Judgment*. (See Steinbock's commendable effort to distill some of Husserl's arduous journey in his Introduction, pp. lviii–lxiii.) Iso Kern's fine work provides us with a critical grid in which to read Part 2's aspirations to serve as the foundation for Part 3.

5. Philosophical Theology

In 1926 Husserl wrote to his friend and former student, Dietrich Mahnke about his teaching duties:

> In the second part of the semester I had to arrange my seminar anew. It had to do with the ultimate foundations of a systematic phenomenology of world-constitution (showing from below how God constitutes the world), and that is the teaching of association that stands in immediate connection with the teaching of original time-consciousness; this is a pure phenomenology of association, and first of all at the most bottom rung the purely hyletic level, considered abstractly for itself.[9]

I assume that Husserl is referring here to the lectures Steinbock has translated. This interpretation by Husserl of what he was up to in these lectures may seem surprising to most readers of the lectures. First, we may note that although the constitution of "world" is not a pervasive theme, there are some excellent pages devoted to it. For example, Husserl says of his dismantling, reductive procedure:

> Going back further and further enables a gradual elucidation of how the unity of the life of consciousness itself is constituted as the field of being on another level of being within the immanence of the life of consciousness, how this unity is constituted in the syntheses of fulfillment and in the syntheses of the concordance of other doxic intentions that are further intertwined with the fulfillment; moreover it enables an elucidation of how things existent in themselves are constituted as a higher level of being in the unity of this life, and the highest level of all, the universe, an entire universe of objective being, of our objective world in its open infinity (p. 142)

Husserl discusses how his dismantling, reductive procedure reveals the life of wakeful consciousness as the field of being and how this, in turn, through

a flow of more or less harmonious syntheses, with an interplay of empty and filled intentions, constitutes higher-order things in themselves, and how these are constituted as holding together, thus comprising the objective world in its open infinity (p. 142). "A thoroughgoing consciousness of one and the same world comes into being through revisions and corrections in the form of consciousness's restoration of the disrupted concordance." (p. 143) "Horizons" as empty intentions that spring into being through new filled intentions or new orientations, themselves must accord with one another in the unity of a total intention of the world-life. Thereby we go beyond the individual perception of specific things to an encompassing context (*umfassenden Zuxammenhang*) of external perception in general and this makes for a unitary awareness of the surrounding world in "a universal synthesis of all empty intentions, even of the empty intentions co-determining sense" (p. 144). Thus we have a manifold of intentional systems forming the unity of a universal synthesis and total intention that pervades all the syntheses, making for "the world" (pp. 144–146) – in spite of seeming surds, discordances, incoherences. Husserl then says: "All of this seems very simple, and yet it is full of marvelous enigmas and gives rise to profound considerations" (p. 146) and he proceeds to recount some of them.

First he recapitulates: On the level of pure passivity there is an irrepressible ebullience of elemental belief, a striving toward the filling of empty intentions which, in turn, opens new ones. There is the modalization of belief and then the establishment and re-establishment of the "in itself." And in spite of the surds and discordances the world coheres; with the collapse here and there of our expectations, "there is sustained a unity of world-certainty that is produced again and again over against the disturbances." (p. 152)

Two intertwining issues of interest for philosophical theology emerge here. The first is that there is *no necessity* in the cohesion of our experiences. The associative demands that found what we call motivation can be annulled at any time. This holds for the pure passive synthetic as well as for the higher-order achievements. A totally chaotic confusion (p. 151; Steinbock translates *einem wirren Durcheinander* with "confused muddle") of the founding flux of hyletic data would make apperceptions impossible; the staying power of apperceptions would have to dissolve because there could be no corroboration. Of course there would always be Now, and Now ever anew, but it cannot be said with necessity what data will occur with the next Now. What could expectation mean with a world of total chaotic confusion as envisaged by Husserl? For example, with a chaotic confusion of colors in the field of perception, the kinaesthetic motivations would lose their force. It is a fact that the world holds, but there is no fact that we can appeal to that will say it *must* hold (p. 153)

Of course, the student of Husserl will recognize the themes of *Ideas I,* §49, where the annihilation of the world as the synthesis of syntheses of percep-

tual things does not affect absolute consciousness. This theme comes up here also at least in two places: At p. 152, Husserl asks whether one external experience can be continually joined to another in such a way as to constitute the unity of world-certainty? "Can it not be that an external experience is the last one, while consciousness endures?" And we know for Husserl that this endurance of consciousness is to be taken in the strong sense: Pages 466–470 contain some of the most intriguing discussions of the beginninglessness and endlessness of the Transcendental I.[10]

I think Steinbock is incorrect when he suggests (p. xxixv) that a generative phenomenology would relativize this position and that we would attain a perspective that would account for "transcendental successors and progenitors." There is no problem for Husserl with our having successors and progenitors as persons in the world, but the original living present or primal presencing is not ever displaceable by any generative considerations. Furthermore any suggestion that the ultimate sense of the "individuality" of the transcendental I, not the person as somebody gendered, acculturated, ineluctably tied to others in the world, is constituted by any factors outside of itself is also, I believe, incorrect. This issue is more controversial; cf. the passage at 58-59 where Husserl speaks of the absolute individual essence of the object; and at p. 192, 1.17 which is ambiguous because it could mean that individuality of the I is constituted in the world or that it comes ineluctably with original time-consciousness. There is no doubt that Husserl thinks of the person as individuated in space, time, etc. But even in the discussion of the genesis of a monad in this volume, Husserl speaks of possible types of the unity of an individual I (p. 633). When he speaks of the individuation of the monad he also refers to the individuation of the absolute monad which is a "simple," indivisible being having a singularly unique *Zusammenhang* that cannot be rent asunder. The one I's immanent time can never go unfilled or have gaps. (See p. 637). This would coincide with Hector-Neri Castañeda's view that even the amnesiac's self-reference is unfailing, even though, strictly speaking, he does not know "who in the world he is." (See also Hua XV, p. 254 for the problem of dissociation of me myself in my sphere of ownmostness.) For some other texts on the transcendental I's uniqueness as not coincident with its individualized historical personality and character and that the first-person sense of I myself can never be exhausted or captured by third-person descriptions, see Hua IV, pp. 292–302; Hua XIV, pp. 11–42, 432–434, Hua XV, pp. 334–335, 374–377, 586–590. Perhaps the most intriguing *Nachlass* text is B I 14 XI. We may say, along with Zahavi, that this unique uniqueness is odd because, on the one hand, it is what all monads qua monads have in common,[11] yet it is what each is in a way that cannot be communicated and shared. It is formal in the sense that each has it in common, and it is empty in the sense that it has no content proper to the world and intentionality; but it is not merely a pure form nor is it empty in the sense that there is a lived sense of a very

specific I-ness inseparable from an odd sense of "this-ness." The discussion with *Eigensein, Eigenheit* in Hua I was in part wrestling with this very issue.

Secondly we have with this general theme the problem of the contingency of the world, and, in some respects the contingency of the I, although this latter is both necessary and contingent in a way the world and everything in it is not (Hua XV, 385).

We may think of Husserl's "metaphysical" meditations[12] as those which have to do with how the realm of nature is a title for contexts and data that are *for* the I and are what the I in its spiritual agency makes sense of. This making sense, as this volume seeks to make amply clear, is rooted in the material of making-sense, i.e., the realm of passive synthesis that goes on its way thankfully without our doing anything. This ultimate realm Husserl regards as a fact that may be called irrational in so far as every explanation presupposes it. Metaphysics has to do with the "problems of the irrational matter of all objectifying forms <belonging> to a world and puts these problems in relation to the teleological-theological problems that are designated by the title: the rational characters of the world..." Husserl goes on to say here[13] that working out this problem of the sense of the world is, of course, different than the elucidations of "sense" by any other discipline than transcendental phenomenology. And he claims that this transcendental phenomenological sense of the world along with the community of monads is a "locus [*Stätte*] wherein necessarily Ideas and the ultimate absolute values realize themselves stage by stage, as a locus of divine formative acts [*Gestalten*]."

For these issues, see in this volume p. 173 where time consciousness is the *Urstätte*, the primal stage or scene, of the constitution of the unity of identity of an objectlike formation, and then of the forms of connection of coexistence and succession of all that makes up the world. In other places he makes use of the term "divine entelechy" to elucidate this sense of the world and its formation in the basement of the transcendental I.[14] Perhaps this suffices to show that the text from the letter to Mahnke that interprets these here translated lectures as having theological significance was not, in Husserl's mind, completely extrinsic to their importance.

6. Translating Husserl

The pages on which I found typos, which for a book for this size were remarkably few, are: pp. xxxvi; lx; 82, l.30; 92, l. 7; 108 l.21; 118, l. 1; 163, l. 19; 248, l. 35; 286, l. 36; 336, l. 22; 452, l. 3. (I confess to not having read the translation of some of the appendices).

Steinbock's translation reads very well and is often delightfully elegant. I think the choice (p. 87) of "leeway" for *Spielraum* is excellent in part because the modern English word prescinds from the Middle English meaning of "lee."

I like "allure" for *Reiz* (Kant, in The *Critique of Judgment*, would perhaps approve, too) and "intimately inherent" for *reell* (p. 54). "Does its own thing" for *dabei ihr eigenes Spiel forttreibt* (p. 459) is inspired.

Often translators are forced to make "no-win" uncomfortable choices; Steinbock most often chooses wisely. My differences sometimes are a matter of aesthetics, but very often they have philosophical edges and, in such cases, at bottom, there is a philosophical issue of interpretation. What follows are some questions and remarks, most of which border on some philosophical issues. They are posed with trepidation, given the overwhelming elegance and reliability of this translation.

Is there not a phenomenological case to be made for staying with "the I," as barbarous as it is, for *das Ich* instead of "the ego"? I think there is a similar problem of losing what Freud was up to with translating his *das Ich* with "the Ego" and *das Es* with "the Id." (On Steinbock's behalf, we may note, of course, that Husserl himself, seems to use *das ego* and *das Ich* interchangeably.)

Although in conversations with Professor Steinbock, I have been assured that it is not so, my reading led me to believe that the pattern of the translation does often, if not for the most part, involve allegiance to Dorion Cairns' doctrine of uniformity, i.e., that when we find Husserl using a word, e.g., *Erlebnis*, we should translate it the same way every time, even if the German word admits of being rendered with one or more alternate and not synonomous words and when the English choice itself does not admit of this ambivalence, e.g., even if it is used in a context that might well mean "experience," or even that which is experienced, rather than "lived experience." Please note that I am convinced of the importance of Husserl's doctrine that all experiences are indeed *erlebt*, i.e., lived experiences, and I understand how that might be a motivation for always translating *Erlebnis* as "lived experiences." But there are problems. Consider that at p. 20 we find a discussion of the concept of *intentionalen Erlebnis,* translated as intentional lived experience, and *Hintergrunderlebnisse*, translated as "background lived experiences." Now in both cases I think we could just as well have read "intentional experience" and "background experiences." Here no harm, however, is done with the uniform rendition. Yet consider p. 21 where "background lived-experiences" are contrasted to the acts corresponding to them. Is one to think that the acts themselves are not lived experiences? Of course not, but this temptation arises only because of the principle of uniformity.

And consider the text at p. 607 in conjunction with the discussion of time consciousness. Here we learn that the life of consciousness in general "is not only a lived-experiencing continually streaming along [*dahin strömendes Erleben*]; at the same time as it streams along it is also immediately the consciousness of this streaming. This consciousness is self-perceiving, although it is a thematically executed awareness on the part of the ego only in exceptional circumstances." Here *Erleben* should be translated as, I believe, sim-

ply "experiencing." The final sentence of this same paragraph reveals why: "Among the *Erlebnissen* are also, then, these so-called external perceptions, which are themselves given to consciousness internally, but for their part are modes of consciousness of 'external' objects, namely, perceptions of them, of tress, of houses, etc." Here we see that *Erlebnis* is a general term that includes all kinds of acts, in particular here acts of "external perception"; and even more frustratingly it sometimes is used even for what is experienced, as in *Hintergrunderlebnisse*. Husserl is at pains to point out that these "experiences" too are *erlebt* but not strictly speaking perceived or experienced. To translate *here Erlebnis* with lived-experience is to have Husserl redundantly say that the lived experiences are lived, i.e., given to conscious internally and non-reflectively.

Paradoxically, on p. 16 when the uniformity principle is violated, i.e., when *Erleben* is translated as "experience" the crucial philosophical point tends to be lost. Here Husserl is talking about the peculiar kind of consciousness of deep dreamless sleep, or perhaps even death: *Im Zustand der Dumpfheit wird auch erlebt*. Husserl goes on to explain that here there is no perception or experience in the proper sense. But the translation reads: "There is an experiencing taking place when in a stupor, as well." This is misleading because I believe here Husserl is building on his basic doctrine of non-reflective self-experience where all experiences are indeed lived (*erlebt*) but not properly experienced or perceived. Even in a stupor or death where there is no experiencing there is the "lived-experiencing" of oneself. The irrepressible process or "whiling" (*Währen*; translated as "enduring") cannot begin or come to a halt because all beginning and halting presuppose its witnessing the "nothing prior" or "nothing after." Life may be contentless, shutdown, and bereft of all worldly apperceptions and hyle, but there is still the inexorable lived Now-form (466 ff.). This inexorable process is precisely the foundation of the consciousness of time; as the living-present it is the foundation of the self-consciousness, the lived-experience, at the heart of all wakeful life; and *mirabile dictu* even when we are comatose or dead, for Husserl, even then *wird auch erlebt*.

Given that the *Logical Investigations* used the term *Anzeichen* (usually translated as "indication" for the form of intentional reference tied to printed or spoken words, Steinbock's choice of "indication" to translate *Hinweisung* is perfectly natural when the text has to do with linguistic signs. Yet, at least in some cases, I think Husserl has in mind the more general "reference" and the doctrine of uniformity misleads. For example, at p. 25 Husserl, in the context of elucidating "saying what I mean," refers to the *Akt der Hinweisung*, translated here as an "indicative act," as an overarching act that "assigns to the connected acts simultaneously a different place and function." This act of reference itself has little resemblance to the kind of pointing or signifying of *Anzeichen* that in English has usually been translated as "indicating" or "indication." There is no signifying base in *this* act of reference analogous to

marks on paper or sounds in the air. Further it is a reference that joins together a plurality of acts, some of which themselves are indicative acts, i.e., are acts presupposing the function of the words; it is a reference to what one means to say by way of bringing about what it takes to say what one means.

Steinbock (p. lii) states that "Husserl not only attributes ipseity to the subject, but also the object. Legion throughout the *Analyses* [translated here] are reference made to the "self" (*Selbst*) of the object. This points not only to an identifiable core that makes up the object, but to the fact that the object is not reducible to consciousness, that it has its own kind of density and otherness that both solicits and evades us, and that one cannot arbitrarily prompt it into being. The object holds itself back, at a distance, which is precisely what allows it to give it-self in an intentional relation." These are excellent points (very dear, by the way to Hedwig Conrad-Martius' "Realontologie"). Yet for obvious reasons, especially the suggestion of a panpsychist ontology, I believe that the *Selbst* and *Selbstheit* of the object are best translated here, without any loss of the features Steinbock wishes to secure, with "itself," and "itselfness" (not "ipseity"). Of course the worldly transcendent "objects" of which the phenomenologist speaks in the transcendental attitude are not simply the equivalent of real things. Yet in transcendental reflection on perception "object" is the articulated perceived thing. Thus declaring perceived things taken as objects to have a "self" misleads. Further, Michel Henry's informing of the current phenomenological scene with his notion of "ipseity" is another subordinate reason for avoiding this term in this context. Of course, Husserl's *Selbst* of the object is a kind of itselfness, a certain kind of standing in, and being rooted in, itself. But as such it is not that of a self-aware, self-determining, self-reflective personal agent or "self." Indeed *Selbst* presents itself as a kind of substance. But this kind of standing in itself or *ousia* is still a mode of giveneness, the "in the flesh," "self"-presentation as opposed to the empty kinds where, as Steinbock nicely translates, the filling intention is mere filler (*Füllsel*), not having the phenomenological standing-in-itself. The *Selbst* or *Selbstheit* of the object of a filled intention is an "it itselfness" achieved by being framed by the prior empty intention where its presentation is second-hand, i.e., a mode of absence and emptiness. Of course, on Steinbock's behalf, the "self-giving" already opens the door to the Self that is giving. An interesting experiment is to read a selected sample passages, e.g., p. 138, ll. pp. 25–36, as if one did not know Steinbock's technical rationale for translating *Selbst* with "self" and then to read it with what I suggest is the more proper rendering, i.e., "itself." Both readings result in correct Husserlian doctrines but the doctrines and the senses would be quite different. One reason would be that in the one case the matter would have to do with what is a matter of first-person evidence whereas the other case would have to do with what the philosopher (in the first-person) makes evident in regard to third-person states of affairs.

At pp. 122–125 Husserl distinguishes between the bringing to intuition in a filling intention of what is intended in an empty intention and the bringing to intuition of an empty intention by way of an *Ausmalung* of what clarifies an empty expectation. Steinbock translates this generally with "picturing." Yet because what we "imagine" (not phantasize: the former requires a pre-given determinable indeterminateness; the latter does not; cf. 141) of an expected filled intention is not properly a picturing or a pictorial intention, i.e., one involving some perceived signifying base that, perhaps through likeness, enables us to intend the pictured, but rather is something conjured up or fleshed out with a "filler," i.e., it is an imaginative filling in the details, the choice of "picturing" for *ausmalen* is perilous. I think "fleshing out" or "sketching in" might be better. It is a tough choice. Husserl himself in these contexts on occasion uses *Bild* in scare-quotes to point to the danger of thinking of *ausmalen* as picturing (see Hua XI, p. 93).

Although I am assured by Anthony Steinbock that it in fact is not so, my perusal of the text found again almost total allegiance to the doctrine of uniformity in his translating *Zusammenhang* with "nexus." Nexus is a Latin-rooted word that means in English "connection," but *Zusammenhang* also means, depending on the where it appears, "connectedness," "cohesion" and "context." (Cf. Hua XIV, pp. 165–166, for a brief meditation on *intuitiven Zusammenhänge*.) Consider the German sentence, *Er hat den Satz aus dem Zusammenhang herausgelöst*. "He took it out of context" makes a different because richer point than "He took it out of its nexus/connection." Contexts involve connections, but there is a thickness to contexts that a mere connection does not necessarily have. A "connection" need not involve the rich sense of a background or matrix of connections that "context" has. The original Latin meaning of *nexus* however is more complex and presumably this is what Steinbock had in mind. In Latin the word means: a tying up, binding together, fastening, joining, interlacing, entwining, clasping; but still it does not mean context. Nevertheless, the Latin *nexus* gives us more of the verbal sense of the German, i.e., *Es hängt zusammen*, than does the rather abstract "connection" and English "nexus." And here again "*Es hängt zusammen*" is not captured as well by "There is a nexus" as by "It holds together" or "It coheres." The *Zusammenhängen* here is richer than a connection, but of course it would not cohere or fit into a context if there were no nexus or connection.

Almost without exception (see p. 230 *et passim*), Steinbock translates *Gegenständlichkeit* and *gegenständlich* with "objectlike formation," or "objectlike character" or "objectlike." I think that in many cases this is the very best choice because Husserl is dealing with what has not yet acquired syntax in the proper sense and other categorial intuitions, and therefore has not become a differentiated something within the world. But what about cases like p. 232 where Husserl is speaking of *eingeschlaffener gegenständlicher Zusammenhang* that is rendered as "a firmly constituted objectlike nexus, only

having fallen asleep." We seem here to have to do with an objective dormant context in the sense it has to do with a noematic horizon or horizon of retained objects; we are not really being asked to focus on an object-like nexus, whatever that might mean. Similarly at p. 244, l. 12. Here memory we learn is the awakening of the "past objectlike formation that was constituted in the original living present." But this *vergangene Gegeständlichkeit* as a re-presenting of what was constituted is not necessarily object-like, e.g., after the fashion of a blur of a series of lights coming out of the darkness, but it might well be a re-presentation of formerly perceived object that is anything but objectlike.

Similarly the uniform translation of *Gestalt* (e.g., pp. 333–334) with "shape" has its drawbacks. I suggest that because *Gestalt* has a connection to the *Gestalten* of the psychology of perception, and because it applies not only to objects in space-time, but also imaginary, memorial, and even ideal objects that we sometimes use the term "guise" if the general "form" is not misleading.

At p. 349 and elsewhere Steinbock translates *gleich* with "uniform." There are more precise words in German, e.g., *einförmig*, that call for this translation. I think "same" would be better; "like," less so. Of course, there is a basic problem in Husserl of whether his identity synthesis is always a case of a strong sense of identity or whether it is not a sameness relation. It is clear however that at p. 249 what is *gleich*, translated as "uniform," is not identical because we have to do with "two separate objects and not one and the same (*ein und dasselbe*)." If the "uniform" objects are not "one and the the same" then *gleich* cannot well be translated with the "same"; thus the temptation of "uniform." Yet "one and the same" here seems to be precisely Husserl's stronger identity in a manifold and what is merely the same is not identical. Further what is uniform might be not the same as well as not identical, i.e., a mannequin, android, and person would be uniform, but not the same and certainly not identical. Of course, the mannequin, the android, and the person would all be similar and like even though not, properly, the same, and surely not identical.

At pp. 179 and 186, *Ordnung* translated always by "order" misses the occasional less honorific meaning, "arrangement."

At p. 211, l. 8 *unmerlichliches* is translated acceptably according to the dictionary, but philosophically wrongly as "unnoticeable"; it should read "unnoticed"; *Merkliches* might therefore read "noticed" not "noticeable."

I think *konstatiert* (p. 259, l. 35) is better rendered as "verify" than "notice." The next sentence (p. 260) makes clear why: If it did not get noticed, it would not be phenomenologically true at all; it has to be "there" for the ego in some way even if it is not *konstatiert*. But Steinbock's choice is justified in so far as "noticed" usually requires that the I is "affected" and the whole problem here is of the null-affections.

At p. 236, n. 145, we find *Verläufe*: I think "'free,' 'subjective' courses" misses the senses of running off, currents, and flowing away and suggests

something connected with school. I propose "coursings." At p. 282, l. 36: *eigene Weise des Bewusstseins* calls for "proper" not "separate mode of consciousness."

At p. 306 l. 28 (and elsewhere) the Whiteheadian term "prehended" is introduced for a phrase like *fortlaufend eine Bestimmung ergriffen*. This can be misleading for Anglo-American ears especially in that Whitehead's prehensions resemble more Husserl's retentions than Steinbock's prehension. In any case the difficulty of the text can only provoke compassion for the translator.

At p. 310, l.8 I believe: "In this latter case we do not speak anywhere of acquired convictions. . ." gets at the point better than "We never speak of acquired convictions. . ."

Notes

1. After the first edition of 1939 several appeared, e.g., *Erfafahrung und Urteil: Untersuchungen zur Genealogie der Logik*, ed. Ludwig Landgrebe (Hamburg: Claasen Verlag, 1964). A discussion of the reduction in the lectures on transcendental logic published here is conspicuously missing; but see the 1926–1929 manuscripts on the reduction in Hua XXXIV, *Zur Phänomenologischen Reduction: Text aus dem Nachlass (1926–1935),* ed. Sebastian Luft (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2002), pp. 1–109.
2. See Husserl's discussion as presented in Ullrich Melle, "Signitive und Signifikative Intentionen," in *Husserl Studies* 15 (1998), pp. 167–181, especially p. 179.
3. Robert Sokolowski, *Presence and Absence* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), chs. 1–3. Incidentally, the basic ontological position worked out in the later chapters are summarized *ceteris paribus* on p. 173, ll. 23–34 of this volume; Hua XI, p. 128, ll. 5–15.
4. William Faulkner, *Light in August* (London: Penguin, 1964), p. 91.
5. For Husserl's own use of this notion of gathering experience, cf. my "A Précis of a Husserlian Philosophical Theology," in Stephen Laycock and James G. Hart, ed. *Essays in Phenomenological Theology* (Albany: SUNY, 1986), pp. 152–154; also my "Toward a Phenomenology of Nostalgia," *Man and World*, v. 6 (1973), pp. 397–420.
6. See Johannes Vokelt, *Das Problem der Individualität* (Munich: C.H.Beck, 1928), pp. 55–72; for the next two paragraphs, cf. my Review Essay, *Genesis, Instinct, and Reconstruction: Nam-In Lee's* ***Edmund Husserl's Phänomenologie der Instincte***, *Husserl Studies* 15 (1998), pp. 101–123.
7. *Idee und Methode der Philosophie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976), all of Section II, but especially pp. 123–157.
8. For some of these issues, cf. my "Agent Intellect and Primal Sensibility," in Tom Nenon and Lester Embree, ed., *Issues in* ***Ideas II*** (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1996), pp. 107–134.
9. *Edmund Husserl: Briefwechsel, Vol. III,* ed. Elizabeth and Karl Schuhmann (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1994), pp. 453–454.
10. For more detail and more texts, cf. my "Phenomenological Time: Its Religious Significance," in *Religion and Time*, ed. A.N. Balslev and J.N. Mohanty (Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 17–45.
11. Dan Zahavi, *Self-Awareness and Alterity* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1999), pp. 165–166.
12. For still the best discussion of these matters, see Iso Kern, *op.cit* , pp. 333–341.

13. See Husserl's text, "Natural Scientific Psychology, Human Sciences and Metaphysics," in Nenon and Embree, *op. cit*., pp. 12–13.
14. See my "A Précis. . .," *op. cit.*; also "Entelechy in Transcendental Phenomenology: A Sketch of the Foundations of Husserlian Metaphysics," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 66 (1992), pp. 189–192.

James G. Hart
Indiana University