

## TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

The *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis* was Edmund Husserl's phenomenological investigation into the *origin of truth*. We find here an early indication of an historical reflection and the identification of a "crisis," the description of primordial dimensions of experience, the genealogy of judgment, and the employment of a new, genetic phenomenological method. While a large portion of the material comprised under this heading is a translation of Husserliana XI, *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis*, it also includes essential additions to the main text of Husserl's lecture, some supplements, and a partial reorganization of the material.

The "Translator's Introduction" is offered as an orientation to this work. This Introduction is divided into four sections. Section 1 situates the work historically and conceptually, discusses its composition and revised title, and provides a basic overview of material making up this lecture. Section 2 situates the *Analyses* in the context of a genetic phenomenology, since it is this methodological approach that enables the description of phenomena treated in the *Analyses*. Section 3 elaborates upon the novel and significant themes in these lectures, such as passivity, affective allure, association, motivation, the unconscious, etc. Section 4 includes final editorial notes on the translation and my acknowledgements. Rather than reserving a special section to explain the translation of various key terms, I integrate this clarification into the course of the explications of sections 2 and 3, and on occasion, discuss them in footnotes appended to the translated text.

### 1. The Historical and Conceptual Context

Presented here as *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis: Lectures on Transcendental Logic* is one of Edmund Husserl's most renowned series of lectures presented in the 1920s.

Offered three times, Winter Semester 1920/21, Summer Semester 1923, and Winter Semester 1925/26, Husserl's lectures are virtually contemporaneous with writings devoted to the problem of "intersubjectivity" and "individuation" (1921–1927) his reflections on the reduction from *Erste Philosophie* (1923/24), and his considerations of cultural crises and its potential for renewal in the *Kaizo* articles (1922–24). As such, the *Analyses* occupy both an historical and a conceptual "middle point" of his work.

Historically speaking, the *Analyses* are situated between major, well-known published works. On the one hand, they arise twenty years after Husserl's ground-breaking *Logical Investigations* (1900/01), a decade and a half after his first lectures on time-consciousness (1905), and nearly ten years following his *Ideas* (1913); on the other, they precede by several years his *Formal and Transcendental Logic* and his *Cartesian Meditations* (both from 1929), and they anticipate his *Crisis* (1934–37) by more than a decade.

While the major insights, novel notions, as well as the import and contribution of these lectures will be explained below, it is possible to say provisionally that these lectures also occupy a center point conceptually. As expressive, even exemplary of his genetic method, they succeed Husserl's earlier phenomenology of consciousness by surpassing both the Cartesian static analysis peculiar to the *Ideas* and the formalism of his early time-consciousness lectures, and they anticipate his generative investigations into intersubjectivity, history, and the lifeworld by initiating a regressive style of inquiry into origins that becomes the hallmark of Husserl's later undertakings in the *Crisis*.

Husserl's fame was well established by the time of these lectures. According to the *Quästurakten* or the "registrar's list" at Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg where Husserl held these lectures, Husserl had 176 persons in attendance the first time he gave them under the title of "Logik" in 1920/21, 133 enrolled in 1923 (now entitled "Ausgewählte phänomenologische Probleme" ["Selected Phenomenological Problems"]), and the numbers tallied 65 in 1925/26 in lectures newly entitled "Grundprobleme

der Logik" ["Fundamental Problems of Logic"].<sup>1</sup> A survey of these registrar's lists reveal a number of names familiar to those acquainted with the phenomenological tradition: Alfred Adler, Oskar Becker, Franz-Josef Brecht, Käthe Hamburger, Max Horkheimer, Fritz Kaufmann, Paul Landsberg, Walther Marseille, Arnold Metzger, Fritz Neumann, Hans Reiner, Wilhelm Szilassi (1920/21); Marvin Farber, Karl Hanser, Ludwig Landgrebe, Hasime Tanabe (1923), and Eugen Fink, (again, Ludwig Landgrebe), Walter Sachs (1925/26).

### 1. *Passive Synthesis and Transcendental Logic*

In recent years, these lectures have achieved a near legendary status under the shorthand rubric of "passive synthesis." How does a lecture series preoccupied with the general problem of logic win its world-wide renown as the "passive synthesis" lectures? There are at least two reasons for this, one editorial (a), one philosophical (b). After discussing these reasons, I explain the composition of this English edition and the reasons for its revised title.

A. One reason these lectures have come to be known as the "passive synthesis" lectures—a reason almost too obvious to mention—is due to the title assigned to them by the editor of *Husserliana XI*, Margot Fleischer, namely, *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis* (1966) [*Analyses Concerning Passive Synthesis*]. Why this title? The original titles Husserl gave to the lectures—"Logic," "Selected Phenomenological Problems," and "Fundamental Problems in Logic"—she notes, were simply too broad for the collection of texts that she assembled in the *Husserliana* volume. While the title "Transcendental Logic," which Husserl assigned to the lectures on the folders containing the manuscripts, did give them more specification, this was to her mind still too imprecise. Instead, she wished to capture the sense attributed to these investigations by Husserl himself, to wit, *Urkonstitutionen* or the analyses of primordial modes of constitution. And while she

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg's Universitätsarchiv for providing me with the *Quästurakten* of these three semesters in question. I would also like to thank Sebastian Luft and Matthias Haenel for transcribing the lists from the Sütterlin handwriting.

could have also chosen the title “Transcendental Aesthetic” to evoke this sense of the investigations—a title suggested by the occurrence of this expression both in the *Analyses* and in *Formal and Transcendental Logic*—she thought that in the wake of Kant it would have given the reader a false impression of what was to be expected from this work. For these reasons, Fleischer settled on the expression “passive synthesis” for the title of this collection, uniting the main portion of the lectures she collated and the supplementary material. This expression is not unwarranted, for it occurs at least a half a dozen times throughout the work. It has *de facto* proved itself to be a title suited to the material selected for publication in Husserliana XI.

B. The title, however, is not the sole reason for these lectures to have acquired their acclaim as the “passive synthesis” work. While the issue of passive synthesis is a fundamental one and does occupy a large portion of Husserl's investigations in Husserliana XI, the context in which the lectures unfold is a broader one. This context, as intimated above, is *transcendental logic*.

Husserl's *Formal and Transcendental Logic* (published in 1929) was conceived as an “Introduction” to phenomenology, and as such joins the *Logical Investigations*, *Ideas I*, and is later joined by *Cartesian Meditations* and the *Crisis*. In distinction to, e.g., *Ideas I*, the way into phenomenology takes place *via* the natural attitude, in particular, as it is functional in the mathematician and logician. While formal logic—understood both as the apophantic science of propositions and deductive relations as well as the formal ontology of individual objects—serves as the starting point of analysis, it cannot be seen as self-sufficient; it requires an investigation into subjective accomplishments that constitute mathematical and logical truths; it requires a “transcendental logic.” But even this, writes Husserl, demands a deeper founding. For as a “critique” of the limits and capacities of logical reasoning, a transcendental logic must understand how a streaming egoic life of consciousness can be constituted as a true being, and it must do this by appealing to a theory of experience and actuality that

finds active cognition and its ideal objects (pp. 112, 259–60, 386).<sup>2</sup>

Thus, when considering the function of the *Analyses* in this broader context, we are witness to a peculiar, but almost typical phenomenological movement, a “zig-zag,” if you will. Even though Husserl understood his *Formal and Transcendental Logic* as another “introduction” to phenomenology, and even though this work followed his lectures making up the *Analyses*, Husserl’s *Formal and Transcendental Logic* itself can be read as an introduction to the project of the *Analyses*. Let me explain.

Husserl’s actual “Introduction” to these lectures given in 1920/21 (included here in the English edition as “Main Text, Part 1,” but published only as an appendix to *Husserliana XVII, Formale und Transcendentale Logik*) begins with a preliminary consideration of the term “logic.” Tracing the term “logic” back to its Platonic founding and to its Greek roots in “*logos*,” and then to the more original “*λέγω*” as “gathering together,” and “expounding upon,” Husserl detects in logic a vocation of the critical justification of reason, and as such, a vocation to be the science of all sciences (pp. 1, 8, 387). As a radical and universal *a priori* theory of science, logic is not to be understood merely as an axiomatic and formalistic deductive system, formed by abstracting general traits from existing or past sciences; for intrinsic to all factual sciences at our disposal is an animating teleological orientation. Even if we never encounter this teleological idea as such, it nonetheless functions guidingly and efficaciously—even if implicitly—when we practice science or operate from theoretical interest. If we find today that the sciences treat their objects of study in a detached, particularized, and fragmented manner, this would only be an expression of the way in which the particular sciences themselves become detached from “the aim, sense, and possibility of genuine science.” They have lost the sense of *their own* orientation that ultimately gives them meaning and to which they refer back as indexes.

---

<sup>2</sup> All references to the *Analyses* in the “Translator’s Introduction” will given to this English edition.

## <Main Texts>

### <PART 1: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE LECTURE ON TRANSCENDENTAL LOGIC><sup>1</sup> [351]

#### 5 <1. Introduction>

It is my intention in these lectures to present a few fundamental considerations toward a phenomenological logic. By the word “logic” I do not understand a subordinated, theoretical, and normative special science in the sense that it is usually taken today, even, say, in the sense in which the modern mathematician has shaped logic as a special mathematical discipline. Logic in the full and universal sense, the sense that we will have in view, is the science that consciously reappropriates the task that was enjoined to logic in general from its historical origin in the Platonic dialectic: namely, the task to be a universal theory of science, and at the same time, a theory of science in principle. A theory of science in principle signifies a science that is in principle a science of all sciences as such.

Logic as a theory of science is then the science of the *a priori* of all sciences as such, the theory of what gives them sense as formations of practical reason, what they must necessarily fulfill if they are actually able to be what they want to be, namely, formations of practical reason. As a pure, *a priori* theory of science, logic wants to bring to light “pure” generalities according to the Socratic-Platonic method. Thus, it does not wish to follow

---

<sup>1</sup> Editor: Wintersemester 1920/21

Translator: The following pagination to the German text corresponds to Husserliana XVII.

empirically the same path as the pre-given so-called “sciences,” the cultural forms that have emerged in fact and that bear the name “science,” only then to abstract from them empirical types. Rather, free from all ties to factuality, it wants to bring to complete clarity  
 5 the teleological idea one always has obscurely in mind when operating from purely theoretical interest. Steadily pursuing the pure possibilities of a cognitive life in general, it wants to bring to the light of day the essential forms of genuine knowledge and science in all their fundamental shapes, as well as the essential  
 10 presuppositions to which they are bound, the necessary methods that lead to them. In all of this, then, lie the necessary norms against which is to be measured how far a factual science (initially only a presumptuous science) conforms to the idea of science, the extent to which its particular modes of knowledge are genuine  
 15 modes of knowledge, its methods, genuine methods—methods, that is, which according to their principle form do justice to a pure and formally general norm. The sense of “formal” here consists in precisely nothing other than this: The guiding question is not the one concerning a particular science with particular regions of  
 20 science, but rather, the question concerning the aim, sense, and possibility of genuine science as such.

Historically, what we call science in the narrow sense today developed from logic, namely, it developed at first from the normative guidelines elaborated in the Platonic dialectic. The  
 25 classical expression which says that all sciences have arisen from the maternal ground of philosophy fits especially well for logic and, on the other hand, for sciences in the particular sense that we all have in mind today.

In a broader sense, we likewise give the name “science” to the  
 30 cosmological theories of the pre-Platonic era, to similar cultural formations of other peoples and times, even to astrologies and alchemies, and the like. But at best they are inchoate forms, preliminary stages of science—and this holds especially for pre-Platonic philosophy or the science of the Greeks no less than it  
 35 does for ancient Egyptian mathematics, for ancient Babylonian astronomy.

Science in a new sense first arises from the Platonic founding of logic, from the radical and critical reflection on essence and

eidetic exigencies of genuine knowledge and of genuine science, and from the disclosure of norms according to which a science arises that is henceforth consciously directed toward normative justification, a science consciously justifying its own method. In accordance with its intention, this is a justification from pure principles, that is, a logical justification. Science in the new sense, then, no longer wants to operate naively on the basis of purely theoretical interest. It strives to justify from principles every step it takes in its authenticity, in its necessary validity. Accordingly, in this case, the original sense is such that the logical insight pertaining to principles, taken from the pure idea of possible knowledge and of the method of knowledge in general, precedes the method undertaken in a factual manner as well as the factual formation of science, and guides it in an *a priori* manner; but the sense is not such that the fact of some arbitrary method and science arising naively, and the type read-off from the fact, would have to pose as a norm in order to provide a model for scientific accomplishments in general.

Plato's logic arose as a reaction to the universal denial of science—a denial characteristic of sophistic skepticism. If skepticism denied what is in principle the possibility of something like science in general then Plato had to consider precisely what is in principle a possibility of science, and he had to found it critically. If science as such was called into question, then of course one could not presuppose the fact of science. In this way Plato was led down the path of the pure idea. His purely ideal logic or theory of science that shapes pure norms (and not read-off from factual sciences), had the mission of only now making possible factual science and guiding it practically. And precisely by fulfilling this vocation it actually did help to fashion sciences in the precise sense: new mathematics and natural science, etc., whose further developments in higher levels are our modern sciences. [353]

However, the original relation between logic and science has become curiously inverted in modern times. The sciences made themselves autonomous. They cultivated highly differentiated methods in the spirit of critical self-justification, a spirit that had now become second nature to them; the fruitfulness of these



methods became evident and certain <through> experience or  
 <through> the reciprocal ratification by all the specialists being in  
 agreement. While they did not cultivate these methods in the  
 naiveté of the everyday person, they did it in a naiveté of a higher  
 5 level, in a naiveté that dispensed with justifying method from pure  
 principles by having recourse to the pure idea in accordance with  
 ultimate *a priori* possibilities and necessities. In other words,  
 logic, which was originally the torchbearer of method and which  
 claimed to be the pure doctrine of principles of possible  
 10 knowledge and science, lost this historical vocation and, under-  
 standably, remained far behind in its development. Even the grand  
 reformation of mathematics and of the natural sciences in the 17<sup>th</sup>  
 Century by figures like Galileo, Descartes, and Leibniz was still  
 determined by logical reflection on the nature and exigency of  
 15 genuine natural knowledge, on their *a priori* necessary goals and  
 methods. Thus, if perfecting logic in these beginnings still  
 precedes perfecting science, and if they still go hand in hand, then  
 this essential relationship is modified in the following epoch, in  
 the epoch in which the sciences, rendered autonomous, turn into  
 20 special branches of science that no longer bother with a logic and  
 that even brush it aside with scorn. But even logic completely  
 departs from its own proper sense and its inalienable task in most  
 recent times. Instead of pursuing the pure essential norms of  
 science according to all their essential formations in order thereby  
 25 to be able to provide an orientation in principle, it is instead happy  
 to copy norms and rules from the factual sciences, especially from  
 the highly esteemed natural sciences.

Perhaps this signals a deeper and more consequential tragedy of  
 modern scientific culture than what one is in the habit of  
 30 lamenting in scientific circles. It is said that the number of special  
 branches of science have grown so vast, and each particular one  
 has become so copiously diffuse in their special field of  
 knowledge and methods, that no one is any longer able to make  
 full use of all this wealth, to enjoy having a command of all the  
 35 epistemological treasures.

The shortcoming of our scientific situation appears to be a  
 much more essential one, a more radical one in the literal sense of  
 the term; it does not concern collective unification and

appropriation, but the rootedness of the sciences, which is a rootedness in principle, and the unification of them from these roots. It would remain a shortcoming even if an incredible mnemonic technology and a pedagogy guided by it would make it possible for us to have an encyclopedic knowledge of the theoretically and objectively established facts in the sum-total of the respective sciences.

Lacking are the centrating ideas that would easily illuminate all thinking in the special branches of science and that would spiritualize all its particular results by relating them to eternal poles; lacking is what removes from all the special branches of science the blinders that are necessary only for their special work; lacking is the capacity to integrate them into the single universal nexus of actual and possible knowledge and thereby to understand this nexus as a nexus that is necessary in principle. But there is still much more that is lacking, namely, the reference back to the phenomenological primordial sources of all knowledge, the deepest founding of all objective sciences arising from the universality of knowing consciousness. Thus, lacking is a systematic fundamental science that would provide an ultimate understanding of all theory arising from the originally sense-giving sources of the subjectivity that accomplishes knowledge.

If the highest task of knowledge is not only calculating the course of the world, but understanding it—as Lotze characterized this task in a well-known dictum—then we have to take this dictum in the sense that we rest content neither with the way in which the positive sciences methodologically shape objective theories, nor with the way in which a theoretical logic directs the forms of a possible genuine theory to principles and norms. We must raise ourselves above the self-forgetfulness of the theoretician who in his theoretical accomplishments devotes himself to the matters, to the theories and methods, and who knows nothing of the interiority of his accomplishment and of the motivations compelling them—who lives in them, but does not have a thematic view of this accomplishing life itself.

We will understand what is accomplished as genuine theory and genuine science only through a clarification of principles that descends into the depths of the interiority that accomplishes

<PART 2:  
ANALYSES CONCERNING PASSIVE SYNTHESIS:  
TOWARD A TRANSCENDENTAL AESTHETIC><sup>20</sup>

<SELF-GIVING IN PERCEPTION>

5 <§1. Original Consciousness and the Perspectival Adumbration of  
Spatial Objects>

External perception is a constant pretension to accomplish something that, by its very nature, it is not in a position to accomplish. Thus, it harbors an essential contradiction, as it were.

10 My meaning will soon become clear to you once you intuitively grasp how the objective sense exhibits itself as unity <in> the unending manifolds of possible appearances; and seen upon closer inspection, how the continual synthesis, as a unity of coinciding, allows the same sense to appear, and how a consciousness of ever  
15 new possibilities of appearance constantly persists over against the factual, limited courses of appearance, transcending them.

Let us begin by noting that the aspect, the perspectival adumbration through which every spatial object invariably appears, only manifests the spatial object from one side. No matter  
20 how completely we may perceive a thing, it is never given in perception with the characteristics that qualify it and make it up as a sensible thing from all sides at once. We cannot avoid speaking of such and such sides of the object that are actually perceived. Every aspect, every continuity of single adumbrations, regardless  
25 how far this continuity may extend, offers us only sides. And to our mind this is not just a mere statement of fact: It is

---

<sup>20</sup> Translator: The following pagination to the German text corresponds to Husserliana XI.

inconceivable that external perception would exhaust the sensible-material content of its perceived object; it is inconceivable that a perceptual object could be given in the entirety of its sensibly intuitive features, literally, from all sides at once in a self-contained perception.

Thus, this fundamental division between what is genuinely perceived and what is not genuinely perceived belongs to the primordial structure of the correlation: External perception and bodily “object.” When we view the table, we view it from some particular side, and this side is thereby what is genuinely seen. Yet the table has still other sides. It has a non-visible back side, it has a non-visible interior; and these are actually indexes for a variety of sides, a variety of complexes of possible visibility. That is a very curious situation peculiar to the very essence of the matter at hand. For proper to the very sense of every perception is perception’s perceived object as its objective sense<sup>21</sup>, that is, this thing, the table that is seen. But this thing is not [merely] the side genuinely seen in this moment; rather (according to the very sense of perception) the thing is precisely the full-thing that has still other sides, sides that are not brought to genuine perception in this perception, but that would be brought to genuine perception in other perceptions.

Generally speaking, perception is original consciousness. We have, however, a curious schism in external perception: Original consciousness is only possible in the form of an actually and genuinely original conscious-having of sides and a co-conscious-having of other sides that are precisely not originally there. I say co-conscious, since the non-visible sides are certainly also there somehow for consciousness, “co-meant” as co-present. But they do not appear as such, genuinely. They are not there like reproductive aspects are, as intuitions that exhibit them; we can nevertheless produce such intuitive presentifications<sup>22</sup> any time we like. Viewing the front side of the table we can, whenever we like, orchestrate an intuitive presentational course<sup>23</sup>, a reproductive

<sup>21</sup> *gegenständlicher Sinn*

<sup>22</sup> *Vergegenwärtigungen*. See translator’s note, p. 110, fn. 64.

<sup>23</sup> *Vorstellungsverlauf*. Translator: The term, “*Vorstellung*” is translated throughout as “presentation,” and not, for example, as representation. Whereas the latter term suggests an

course of aspects through which the non-visible side of the thing would be presented to us. But here we are doing nothing more than presentifying a course of perceptions to ourselves in which we would see the object—passing from a perception to new  
 5 ones—from ever new sides in original aspects. Still, that only happens in exceptional circumstances. It is clear that a non-intuitive pointing beyond or indicating is what characterizes the side actually seen as a mere side, and what provides for the fact that the side is not taken for the thing, but rather, that something  
 10 transcending the side is intended in consciousness as perceived, by which precisely *that* is actually seen. Noetically speaking, perception is a mixture of an actual exhibiting that presents in an intuitive manner what is originally exhibited, and of an empty indicating that refers to possible new perceptions. In a noematic  
 15 regard, what is perceived is given in adumbrations in such a way that the particular givenness refers to something else that is not-given, as what is not given belonging to the same object. We will have to understand the meaning of this.

[5]

Let us first note that every perception, or noematically  
 20 speaking, every single aspect of the object in itself points to a continuity, to multifarious continua of possible new perceptions, and precisely to those in which the same object would show itself from ever new sides. In every moment of perceiving, the perceived is what it is in its mode of appearance [as] a system of  
 25 referential implications<sup>24</sup> with an appearance-core upon which appearances have their hold. And it calls out to us, as it were, in these referential implications: “There is still more to see here, turn me so you can see all my sides, let your gaze run through me, draw closer to me, open me up, divide me up; keep on looking me  
 30 over again and again, turning me to see all sides. You will get to know me like this, all that I am, all my surface qualities, all my inner sensible qualities,” etc.

You understand what I mean to convey with this suggestive manner of speaking. In the particular present perception I have just

---

active cognitive operation, “*Vorstellung*” is functional on a passive level of experience as well.

<sup>24</sup> *Verweisen*

these aspects and their modifications, and no others, just these aspects that are always limited ones. In each moment the objective sense is the same with respect to the object as such, the object that is meant; and it coincides with the continual course of momentary appearances, as for instance this table here. But what is identical is a constant  $x$ , a constant substrate of actually appearing table-moments, but also of indications<sup>25</sup> of moments not yet appearing. These indications are at the same time tendencies, indicative tendencies that push us toward the appearances not given. They are, however, not single indications, but entire indicative systems, indications functioning as systems of rays that point toward corresponding manifold systems of appearance. They are pointers into an emptiness since the non-actualized appearances are neither consciously intended as actual nor presentified. In other words, everything that genuinely appears is an appearing thing only by virtue of being intertwined and permeated with an intentional empty horizon, that is, by virtue of being surrounded by a halo of emptiness with respect to appearance. It is an emptiness that is not a nothingness, but an emptiness to be filled-out; it is a determinable indeterminacy. For the intentional horizon cannot be filled out in just any manner; it is a horizon of consciousness that itself has the fundamental trait of consciousness as the consciousness of something.

In spite of its emptiness, the sense of this halo of consciousness is a prefiguring that prescribes a rule for the transition to new actualizing appearances. Seeing the front side of the table, I am also conscious of the back side, along with everything else that is non-visible, through an empty pointing ahead, even though it be rather indeterminate. But no matter how indeterminate it may be, it is still a pointing ahead to a bodily shape, to a bodily coloring, etc. And only appearances that adumbrate things of that kind and that determine more closely what is indeterminate in the framework of this prefiguring can be integrated concordantly; only they can stay the course of an identical  $x$  of determination as the same, being determined here newly and more closely. This holds time and again for every perceptual phase of the streaming process

---

<sup>25</sup> *Hinweisen*

of perceiving, for every new appearance, only that the intentional horizon has altered and shifted. Proper to every appearing thing of each perceptual phase is a new empty horizon, a new system of determinable indeterminacy, a new system of progressing  
 5 tendencies with corresponding possibilities of entering into determinately ordered systems of possible appearances, of possible ways that the aspects can run their course, together with horizons that are inseparably affiliated with these aspects. In the concordant coinciding of sense, they would bring the same object  
 10 as being ever newly determined to actual, fulfilling givenness. To our mind, the aspects are nothing for themselves; they are appearances-of only through the intentional horizons that are inseparable from them.

We thereby distinguish further between an inner horizon and an  
 15 outer horizon of the respective aspect-appearance. It should be recognized that the division applying to what is genuinely perceived and what is only co-present entails a distinction between determinations with respect to the content of the object [a] that are  
 20 actually there, appearing in the flesh<sup>26</sup>, and [b] those that are still ambiguously prefigured in full emptiness. Let us also note that what actually appears is, in itself, also laden with a similar distinction. Indeed, the call resounds as well with respect to the side that is already actually seen: “Draw closer, closer still; now  
 25 fix your eyes on me, changing your place, changing the position of your eyes, etc. You will get to see even more of me that is new, ever new partial colorings, etc. You will get to see structures of the wood that were not visible just a moment ago, structures that were formerly only viewed indeterminately and generally,” etc. Thus, even what is already seen is laden with an anticipatory  
 30 intention. It—what is already seen—is constantly there as a framework prefiguring something new; it is an *x* to be determined more closely. There is a constant process of anticipation, of preunderstanding. In addition to this inner horizon there are then also outer horizons, prefigurings for what is still devoid of any  
 35 intuitively given framework that would require only more differentiated ways of sketching it in.

[7]

---

<sup>26</sup> *leibhaft*

<DIVISION 1:  
MODALIZATION>

[25]

<Chapter 1:  
THE MODE OF NEGATION>

5 <§5. Disappointment as an Occurrence that Runs Counter to the  
Synthesis of Fulfillment>

We must now expand our insights in a new direction. Up until  
now we have investigated the continuous, unitary courses of  
perception in which the unity of an object is maintained  
10 concordantly. This took place by virtue of the unanimity of a  
coinciding that bestows fulfillment upon the intentions, namely,  
the intentions that are aroused as perception progresses. The  
process was a constant process of expanding knowledge. This  
expansion proceeds through discrete syntheses of perception in  
15 such a way that a thing, already fairly familiar through a previous  
perception, occasionally gets perceived again under a  
simultaneous remembering of previous perceptions, that is, in  
straightforward recognition. As we can easily see, the new  
acquisition of knowledge continues the previous acquisition with  
20 respect to new sides. But all of this concerns syntheses of  
fulfillment, that is, of concordance.

There is, however, an occurrence that runs counter to  
fulfillment, namely, disappointment; there is an occurrence that  
runs counter to determining more closely, namely, determining  
25 otherwise. Instead of the acquired knowledge being preserved and  
enriched further, it can be placed in question, annulled. In short,  
there is something like the difference between the modalized  
consciousness of being in distinction to the originally non-  
modalized consciousness of being, and we are now in a position of  
30 gaining deeper insights into the structure of the modalities of



being and their constitution, and noetically speaking, insights into the structure of perceptual belief and its modifications such as “doubt,” “supposition,” “negation,” etc.

As we know, the intentional systems occurring in the normal case of perception that we have described (noetically speaking, the apprehensions apperceiving the respective sensation-complexes) have the character of actual or potential expectations. That is, if in perceiving I instigate a kinaesthetic series, for instance, a certain head movement, the appearances will run their course in a motivated succession such that they accord to my expectation. Thus, in the normal case of perception, all fulfillment progresses as the fulfillment of expectations. These are systematized expectations, systems of rays of expectations which, in being fulfilled, also become enriched; that is, the empty sense becomes richer in sense, fitting into the way in which the sense was prefigured.

But every expectation can also be disappointed, and disappointment essentially presupposes partial fulfillment; without a certain measure of unity maintaining itself in the progression of perceptions, the unity of the intentional lived-experience would crumble. Yet despite the unity of the perceptual process occurring with this abiding, unitary content of sense, a break does indeed take place, and the lived-experience of “otherwise” springs forth.

There is also a lived-experience of “otherwise” without a break, a disappointment of a regular style, which by virtue of its regularity can be anticipated and which thus can even be prefigured in the empty horizon. In other words, there is a steady consciousness of alteration whose phenomenological analysis is fundamental for [understanding] the constitution of a change. Change is a continuous process of becoming otherwise; however, this becoming otherwise maintains unity, namely, a unity of the object remaining concordantly the same as the substratum of its continuous alterations in and through which it becomes otherwise, and in and through which it becomes otherwise time and again.

Let us now already assume a unitary object, be it unchanged or changed, that first abides “concordantly” in the continuity of the original experience, “getting known” better and better. But then all of a sudden, and contrary to all expectation, green rather than red

[26]

shows up on the back side that is now becoming visible; instead of the ball-shape indicated by the front side, an indentation or something angular appears, etc. Prior to the ensuing perception of the back sides, perception in its living flow was intentionally

5 prefigured toward red and ball-shaped; perception's referential indicators were determinately directed toward red and ball-shaped. And rather than being fulfilled in this sense, and thereby being ratified, the intentional prefigurings and referential indicators became disappointed. The general framework of sense is retained

10 and fulfilled, and only at this point, only after we have these intentions, does "something else" occur: a conflict between the intentions still living, and the contents of sense being newly instituted intuitively along with their more or less full intentions. We have a system of continual concordance once again insofar as

15 the insertion of this new framework into the old one restores concordance. But in a partial system we have a superimposing group of intentions that exist in the relationship of disappointment with those upon which they superimpose. After we saw the green and the indentation, and after they lasted concordantly during the

20 course of corresponding appearances, the entire perceptual sense gets altered, and not merely the sense in the current expanse of perception; rather, from it the alteration of sense radiates back to the preceding perception and all its previous appearances. They are reinterpreted in their very sense as "green" and "indented."

25 Naturally, this does not take place in explicit acts; but if we were to go back actively, we would necessarily find the altered interpretation explicitly and consciously, that is, the continual concordance that has been produced. But layered beneath this is something that does not accord with it, and actually what does not

30 accord pertains to the entire series that has flowed-off insofar as we are still conscious of the old apprehension in memory. But it especially comes to life at that place where "green" and "indented" emerged. Occurring here is not only the phenomenon of conflict involving both contrary determinations, ball-shaped

35 and indented, red and green; rather, the "it is not ball-shaped and not red," the empty red-intention, is "annulled," negated by the superimposing "green," that is, by the full superimposing green-perception; and with it the substratum itself, the thing itself, which

[27]



constituting consciousness is to be made responsible for this accomplishment. Here the source of really radical clarifications is perception; and for reasons that will become clearer below, transcendent perception is privileged where these clarifications are concerned. What we have said holds even though the specific concept of judgment, the one that dominates the [inner] logic of theory does not even occur yet in the framework of mere perception. Still, the modalities occur precisely here, and it is no coincidence that perception and judgment have these modalities in common. From there we will be able to show that the modes of belief necessarily play their role in all modes of consciousness. Moreover, we must gain clarity so that we can surmount the confusion that blinded such a brilliant researcher as Brentano concerning the questions of belief and judgment, and on the other hand, so that we can understand the constant role of modalities in logic. Let this suffice as an indication of what is to come. [29]

Our analyses up to now have illustrated that every phase of perception presents itself as a system of rays of actual and potential intentions of expectation. During the continual elapse of phases—and during the normal case of perception, during the so-called perception that occurs usually and straightforwardly—there is a continual process of inciting actualizations, then further, there is the continuous fulfillment of expectations whereby fulfillment is always a process of determining more closely. But we also have now the occurrence of disappointment as a possibility that runs counter to the fulfillment of expectations. In order for a unity of an intentional process to be maintained, however, a certain measure of thoroughgoing fulfillment must be presupposed under all circumstances. From a correlative direction this means that a certain unity of sense must be maintained throughout the course of changing appearances. Only in this way do we have the constancy of a *single* consciousness, a unitary intentionality spanning all phases during the course of lived-experience with its appearances.

What happens now if a disappointment occurs in the [perceptual] process rather than a fulfillment, regardless of whether a changing or unchanging object had been constituted in it perceptually? So, for example, we see a uniform, well-rounded red ball; the flow of perception has flowed-off for some time, and

<DIVISION 2:  
EVIDENCE>

<Chapter 1:  
THE STRUCTURE OF FULFILLMENT>

5       <§16. Fulfillment: Syntheses of Empty Presentation and  
          Corresponding Intuition><sup>60</sup>

By pursuing our interest especially in the clarification of knowledge, that is, by focusing especially on the function of knowledge within pure subjectivity, we had acquired an orderly series of systematic insights before our break.<sup>61</sup> At the end [of the lecture] we were occupied with the rudiments, the most basic elements of a theory of judgment. By undertaking a systematic study of perceptions we came across the moment of belief, of passive *doxa*, and attended to the modalizations of belief.

15 Naturally, what was demonstrated here is mirrored *mutatis mutandis* in each mode of intuition and accordingly in remembering, which in itself is characterized as a re-perceiving, as it were. We then contrasted with these doxic events occurring in the passive sphere, the functions of higher judicative activities that

20 are founded in them. By doing this, we acquired an initial, concrete understanding of the opposition between the passive and experiential accomplishment and, on the other hand, the spontaneous accomplishment of thought, the accomplishment of the ego who in the strict sense makes judgments, makes decisions,

25 and who actively appropriates and establishes its acquisition of knowledge.

---

<sup>60</sup> Editor: See Appendix 5: <Intuitive Presentations and Empty Presentations>, and Appendix 6: <Sense and Intuition> pp. 445ff. and 447ff.

<sup>61</sup> Editor: Christmas break, 1925.

[66]

We are now going to study the peculiar characteristics and accomplishments of the sphere of judgment that are of particular importance for logic, characteristics and accomplishments that we already encounter in the sphere of passivity or mere receptivity. I mean the functions of fulfilling confirmation,<sup>62</sup> corroboration. They are special synthetic functions that we already encountered much earlier, but at that time we were unable to clarify their relation to other syntheses sufficiently. While carrying out our analysis of perception we had to point to its synthetic character as something fundamental. Perception is a process of streaming from phase to phase; in its own way each one of the phases is a perception, but these phases are continuously harmonized in the unity of a synthesis, in the unity of a consciousness of one and the same perceptual object that is constituted here originally. In each phase we have primordial impression, retention, and protention, and unity arises in this progression by the protention of each phase being fulfilled through the primordial impression of the phase that is continuously contiguous to it. Considered concretely, as in process, the perceptual lived-experience is continuously being fulfilled, and precisely for this reason, it is a unity of continual concordance. When this concordance is ruptured, which is altogether possible, modalization occurs, and we no longer have a perception in the normal sense, namely, we are no longer continually consciousness of the one perceptual object as something existing in a straight-forward manner.

We also speak of fulfillment in other respects within the sphere of mere presentations to which we restrict ourselves now, within mere receptivity. And so, with respect to all expectations that arise as special presentations in presenting life. We expect something to happen—now the very thing occurs, confirming the expectation in the most original confirmation of a ratifying perception. We are interested in such an original confirmation in which a presenting

---

<sup>62</sup> Translator: Throughout this Division, Husserl tends to use the term *Bewahrheitung* and its cognates to refer to a corroboration or kind of “verification” belonging to the *passive sphere*, and the term *Bewährung* and its cognates to refer to a process of verification proper belonging to the active sphere. To remain consistent with Husserl’s employment of these two different terms, I translate the former term *Bewahrheitung* as “confirmation,” and the latter *Bewährung* as “verification.” See p. 133.

intention is fulfilled in a synthesis of the intended object and the corresponding object itself: We can also say that we are making an initial study of the nature of evidence. Making a presentation evident to us is indeed bringing it to originally fulfilling confirmation. Thus, it is not a question of an arbitrary synthesis of identification; rather, it concerns a synthesis of a presentation that is not self-giving with a presentation that is self-giving.

Naturally, we take at first the mode of certainty and positionality as a basis for these presentations. From the outset we see that the important distinction between empty and full or intuitive presentations, a distinction with which we are familiar, especially becomes an issue for the syntheses of confirmation. To be sure, we know that even a perception, in particular, an external, transcendent perception, can occur in syntheses of fulfillment— and not only as a perception confirming an intention; rather, it can even occur as a mere intention that becomes fulfilled in new perceptions. This happens, for example, when we perceive a tree from the front, and wanting to know it better, draw nearer to it and now perceive it in new perceptions; by determining the tree more closely, we also have a fulfilling confirmation. Meanwhile, every external perception harbors its inner and outer horizons, regardless the extent to which perception has the character of self-giving; this is to say, it is a consciousness that simultaneously points beyond its own content. In its fullness it simultaneously points into an emptiness that would only now convey a new perception. The self-givenness of a spatial thing is the self-givenness of a perspectival appearing object that is given as the same in the fulfilling synthesis of appearances intertwining and devolving upon one another. But it is the same object that itself appears now this time in one way, now another time in another way, appearing in other perspectives, always pointing from a perspective to ever new perspectives in which the same object that is exhibited is continually determined more closely, and yet is never determined definitively. For we always expect appearances of newly opened, empty horizons. Thus, where there is no horizon, where there are no empty intentions, there is likewise no [synthesis of] fulfillment. A datum that is given in immanent perception, i.e., that is adequately given in each Now does not therefore admit of any

[67]

further confirmation with respect to this Now. Still, it does occur as a fulfillment insofar as the preceding perceptual phase already points to what is to come. This fulfillment is a fulfillment of an anticipation and is a definitive, absolute fulfillment, or evidence.

- 5 Accordingly, it may now seem that the unity of a synthesis of fulfillment (of a confirming one) would be characterized by the fact that an empty consciousness (be it a consciousness that is standing completely empty for itself, or a consciousness incompletely saturated by intuition) would be synthetically united  
 10 with an appropriate intuition, whereby what is emptily intended<sup>63</sup> and what is intuited coincide in the consciousness of the same [object], that is, coincide in the identity of the objective sense. One would like to think, however, that fulfillment is certainly a bringing to intuition: confirming an intending, that is, meaning an  
 15 object but not having the object itself intuitively, or having it intuitively, but still meaning beyond what is already intuitively given, and now passing over to the intuition of what is not yet given. But we will see that this characterization would not work, for not every process of bringing to intuition, that is, not every  
 20 fulfillment is confirming.

[68]

- It is of fundamental importance to distinguish between the different possible syntheses pertaining here to intuitions and empty presentations, and to characterize them in more detail. The possible syntheses are determined according to their  
 25 phenomenological character by the types of intuitions and empty presentations founding them. Conversely, one can become aware for the first time of the different sorts of founding presentations in the different operations of closely related presentations within the synthesis, and in the different character that the synthesis assumes  
 30 in these cases. Without distinguishing between different possible syntheses, one might easily overlook distinctions within intuitions and within empty presentations that could occur here.

---

<sup>63</sup> *Vorstelliges*



## &lt;§17. Description of the Possible Types of Intuition&gt;

Let us pursue this matter more deeply by proceeding initially from the general distinction between intuitive presentation and empty presentation. The intuitive presentation has for its part  
 5 different modes. Perception is the primordial mode of intuitiveness (as always, understood as doxic positionality). It is to be contrasted with the mode of presentification, which, upon closer inspection has various forms, too. By studying intuitive remembering we have learned that a remembering in itself  
 10 manifests itself as a presentification of a perception, thus, that it is not structured as simply as a perception. It is a present lived-experience that is not itself a perception; instead, it presentifies a perception in the temporal mode of a past perception, and precisely thereby it presentifies its previous perceptual object as  
 15 having-been. Every other kind of presentification has a similar structure.<sup>64</sup> Thus, there are intuitive presentations of something present that are surely not perceptions of that present something, but rather are presentifications of it: for example, when we make intuitively present the back side of a thing that is more or less  
 20 familiar from a previous perception, or when we make intuitively present the co-presence of other things, like when we intuitively presentify Berthold's Fountain.<sup>65</sup> Here we do not merely <present> it as the fountain seen yesterday in its mere pastness, but <present> it as now and as actual, just like the intuitions that we

---

<sup>64</sup> Translator: Empathy [*Einführung*] as a mode of presentification does not make present a previous or futural perceptual object because the other or the alien can in principle never be given "originally." This is certainly different from a remembering that literally re-presents its object, or from a futural presentification that anticipates a futural object as present, or finally from a co-presentification in which something that is not given in the original at present, but can in principle be present (cf. below 367, 373f., 377f.). Accordingly, rather than translate *Vergegenwärtigung* as re-presentation, which would be well-suited for temporal acts, I prefer the common neologism, presentification, since it includes the full complement of acts ranging from imagination to empathy.

<sup>65</sup> The original Berthold's Fountain to which Husserl refers was located in the center of Freiburg at the junction of Kaiser-Joseph-Straße and Salzstraße. It was erected in 1807 for Bertold III. Herzog von Zähringen and was destroyed in 1944. In 1965 a new fountain was erected for the Dukes of Zähringen, the founders of Freiburg. (This is not to be confused with the fountain built in Freiburg to commemorate the Franciscan Friar Berthold Schwarz, which was erected in 1852 and is still standing on the Rathausplatz.)



in the flow of retention fading away into the distant horizon of retention. But in addition to this, emergent rememberings as well. [118]  
Between the noematic components of something present and something remembered we find a phenomenologically peculiar  
5 connective trait that can be expressed in the following way: Something present recalls something past. Likewise, a second remembering can occur while a remembering runs-off; the second remembering can occur along with the first one in a nexus that is characterized noematically by the fact that the first recalled event  
10 recalls the second recalled event. A perceptual consciousness, that is, a consciousness that is constituted originally can accordingly be characterized as a consciousness that awakens, awakening a reproductive consciousness, and this consciousness can function as awakening in its turn as fetching a past of consciousness, as it  
15 were.

It follows from the exposition of our previous lectures that association is a possible theme of purely phenomenological research. For instance, there is still something that remains of the Modern, customary psychology of association after the  
20 phenomenological reduction; if one goes back to its immediate experiential material, the phenomenological reduction will initially yield a core of phenomenological facts that also remain within the pure inner attitude and that will shape the preliminary point of departure for further research. If we pursue this more deeply, we  
25 will realize that the path is cleared from here toward a universal theory of the genesis of a pure subjectivity, and in particular, initially in relation to its lower level of pure passivity. Phenomenological eidetic analyses of consciousness constituting a temporal objectlike formation already led to the beginnings of a  
30 lawful regularity of genesis prevailing in subjective life. We see very quickly that the phenomenology of association is, so to speak, a higher continuation of the doctrine of original time-constitution. Through association, the constitutive accomplishment is extended to all levels of apperception. That the specific  
35 intentions arise through it is already clear to us. Actually, Kant already saw that in phenomenological contexts, which we first come across in the natural departure from objective-psychological observations under the rubric of association, not mere accidental

facts, but rather, an absolutely necessary lawful regularity is manifest without which a subjectivity could not be. But his brilliant doctrine of the transcendental necessity of association is not supported by a phenomenological eidetic analysis. It does not attempt to show what is actually at issue under the rubric of association with respect to elementary facts and essential laws, and thereby making comprehensible the genetic unitary structure of pure subjective life. On the other hand, I do not want to say that the development of phenomenology has already progressed so far that it would have neatly solved the genetic problems existing here. But it is far enough along to be able to specify these problems and to sketch the method for their solution. [119]

A first group of pure phenomena and nexuses to which the traditional doctrine of association leads us concerns facts of actual and possible reproduction, or more clearly, of actual and possible remembering. When we practice the phenomenological reduction, they are initially given as transcendental facts. Accordingly, this is still prior to eidetic, essential insight that would intuitively obtain essential necessity and essential laws. Right in the midst of these facts are the phenomena that interest us: the splitting of rememberings into rememberings. These rememberings have been muddled, as we say, such that the memorial images of separate pasts have blended to form a unity of an illusory image. This problem of the fusion of rememberings leads us a step further, then, to the problem concerning the extent to which mere phantasies lead back, through intentional analyses, to rememberings, that is, the extent to which they are products of the fusion of rememberings with respect to their intuitive content.

The doctrine of the genesis of reproductions and of their formations is the doctrine of association in the first and more genuine sense. But inseparably connected to this, or rather, grounded upon this is a higher level of association and doctrine of association, namely, a doctrine of the genesis of expectations, and closely related to it, the genesis of apperceptions to which belong the horizons of actual and possible expectations. All in all, it concerns the genesis of the phenomena of expectation, that is, of those specific intentions that are anticipatory. We could also call this association inductive association. For it is a matter here of the [120]

founding level proper to passivity, the founding level of all the active-logical processes that are treated under the rubric of inductive proofs.

Taking them in order, let us now first of all observe  
5 reproductive association, naturally, as a purely phenomenological occurrence. We can <call to mind> here the Aristotelian distinction between what is in itself first and what is for us first, namely, what is first from the standpoint of explanatory knowledge (knowledge that makes comprehensible). The  
10 associative facts and essential insights of the reproductive sphere that are accessible to us as first (for essential reasons and not accidentally) concern reproductively awakening intentional lived-experiences and awakened reproductions in which we are conscious or become conscious of objects as objects for  
15 themselves. It does not initially occur to us that this is something special; therefore, wherever we speak of a consciousness, of an intentional lived-experience, we think without further ado of a consciousness of something offering itself as something for itself, a consciousness of something prominent, existing in a singular  
20 manner.

But it is precisely the analysis of associative phenomena that draws our attention to the fact that consciousness must not necessarily be a consciousness of a single object for itself, and accordingly, we touch on a new problem here: how a  
25 consciousness of something particular and how a consciousness of explicit particulars becomes possible as a consciousness of a multiplicity and a consciousness of wholeness; namely, a comparative analysis also shows the opposing possibility of many [elements], indeed, a multiplicity being continually fused into a  
30 unity within one consciousness, *implicite*, such that consciousness is not a consciousness of a multiplicity, a consciousness that becomes aware of separated particulars in a unitary and yet separate manner. The following example can clarify roughly what that “*implicite*” should mean. A white square, which is in itself  
35 completely and homogeneously white without any specks and so forth, becomes prominent as a single square, and many like squares as a multiplicity of particular ones. But however much every square is given as a unity, and given as a unity that is

undifferentiated in itself, it is indeed our view that each one can be divided in a number of ways; to our mind each one is in itself a continuum of white whose phases are just not prominent for themselves. Naturally, that is not an arbitrary interpretation but one that has a phenomenological basis. [121]

Let us now set aside the problem of prominent particulars and their implicit multiplicities and only point to the fact that for the time being we can only catch sight of associations, and only of direct ones, by having particular objects given to us phenomenologically or by having in consciousness closely consolidated multiplicities forming unities for themselves or by having articulated wholes, in short, if we have unitary, prominent objectlike formations which, as such unities, recall other unities as past ones; naturally, recalling them as past for us. Remaining within the phenomenological reduction, the associative relation concerns exclusively the *given*<sup>105</sup> objects *as such* in their respective noematic mode, that is, correlatively it concerns the corresponding modes of consciousness. We are not saying that we see this “recalling something” everywhere, but only that we see it in certain cases, that is, that we have grasped it in originary prehension. For example, if winding down a path we catch sight of a cirque, we are reminded of another cirque, one that emerges reproductively. We can note that the reproduced one is not only altogether reproduced, and is not only an altogether reproduced, similar object, but that there exists a certain relation between them both beyond the mere relation of similarity. Something present recalls something reproductively presentified, which is to say, there is a tendency that is directed from the former to the latter and a tendency that is fulfilled by intuitive reproduction. It follows from this that we, as attentive egos, look from this to that by being referred from the one to the other; and we can also say: The one points to the other—even though there is still not an actual relation of indication by signs and designation. Further, the phenomenon gives itself as a genesis, with the one term as awakening, the other as awakened. The reproduction of the latter gives itself as aroused through the awakening.

---

<sup>105</sup> *bewußten*