

Neglecting the Question of Being: Heidegger's Argument Against Husserl

This is a pre-print version of the paper published in *Inquiry* 52(6), 2009, pp. 574-595. Please cite the published version.

RYAN HICKERSON

Western Oregon University, USA

ABSTRACT *This paper claims that the argument Heidegger leveled at Husserl in his Marburg lecture courses trades on a confusion. Heidegger confused neglecting the question of being with presupposing an answer to the question of being. No reasons have been given for thinking that the former is objectionable, and the latter is only as objectionable as the thing presupposed. This paper does not, thereby, show Heideggerian phenomenology is not superior to Husserlian phenomenology; but it does show that Heidegger's so-called "immanent critique of Husserl" was anything but, and hence that Husserlian phenomenology was not (as Heidegger claimed) "unphenomenological."*

1. Introduction

Martin Heidegger's philosophical legacy is closely interwoven with a broad critique of traditional metaphysics and epistemology. Whether it proves true or false that "No major philosophical thinker of this century has had as extensive or as profound a knowledge of the Western philosophical tradition as Heidegger,"¹ many philosophers influenced Heidegger's

Correspondence Address: Ryan Hickerson, Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies, Western Oregon University, 345 N. Monmouth Ave., Monmouth OR 97361, USA. E-mail: hickersr@wou.edu

thinking, and there are now many vectors of access to his work. My approach here is from one familiar direction: Heidegger's critique of Husserlian phenomenology. The full account of the complicated relationship between the two men, erstwhile mentor and assistant, includes the biographical details of a personal and professional betrayal that I will here take for granted. I focus instead on Heidegger's stated reasons for rejecting the Husserlian concepts of *consciousness* and *intentionality*, uncovering what I take to be the most general form of criticism Heidegger made of Husserl in his Marburg lecture courses.² The Marburg lectures are not the sole source for assessing Heidegger's treatment of Husserlian phenomenology (let alone Husserl himself) but they are a safe place to turn for Heidegger's best public argument against Husserl, crafted in the years that he was working out *Being and Time* and developing his own most characteristic concepts.³

The preponderance of Heidegger scholarship now makes the case, despite appearances of being *sui generis*, that there are actually deep similarities between the Heideggerian and Husserlian projects.⁴ The differences in their details are, of course, still being contested.⁵ But no philosopher of historical sensibility now finds it particularly surprising to discover the erstwhile assistant employed some of the erstwhile mentor's methods and concepts, while profoundly rejecting others. If the particular concepts that concern us are *consciousness* and *intentionality*, and Heidegger was supposed to have advanced upon Husserl by replacing these with *Dasein* and *transcendence*, respectively, a question naturally arises: why do so? According to Heidegger, what was wrong with thinking of ourselves as consciousnesses characterized by intentionality?

Most simply put, Heidegger charged Husserl with neglecting the question of being

[*Versäumnisses der Seinsfrage*].⁶ I will argue below that this Heideggerian criticism is actually a nested set of accusations, not merely that Husserl failed to make the being of consciousness and its objects the central theme of his philosophical investigations, but also that Husserl uncritically adopted the mistakes of a traditional, so-called "Cartesian," account of each. Those two (actually four) quite different accusations are often discussed in the literature, but they are also frequently conflated with one another. My modest contribution, in more crisply distinguishing them, will mostly be forensic: a clearer understanding of Heidegger's Marburg argument against Husserl. Ultimately, we should know better whether Heidegger himself articulated good reasons for his famed rejection of consciousness (as intentional experience), or whether the renunciation of that particularly Husserlian phenomenological commitment still requires argument.

Heidegger's core accusation was that Husserl uncritically presumed that consciousness and its objects must be investigated scientifically, something he associated with a pernicious theoretical consequence: an anti-practical attitude that treats all intentionality as part of a "general hegemony of the theoretical."⁷ To uncover the significance of that claim, as the foundation of Heidegger's argument against Husserl, I will employ (only) choice quotations in roughly reverse chronological order, from 1928, 1926-27, 1925, and then back to 1923-24. This style of "high altitude" reading has inherent limitations, but what the long view can reveal is the singular argument mounted throughout the Marburg lectures. I first provide the distinction required to understand the argument's general form (§2), and then show how specific claims from several different lecture courses fit that form (§§3-4). My hope is that the analysis, in directing our attention to the variety of Cartesianisms that Husserl was supposed to have

adopted (§5), will sharpen our understanding of the conditions under which we should judge Heidegger's argument to have been wholly (or partially) unsuccessful (§6).

2. Neglecting the Difference Between Presupposition and Neglect

Some of Heidegger's earliest public criticism of Husserlian phenomenology came in the lecture courses he gave at the University of Marburg from 1923 to 1928. Unlike *Being and Time* (1927), those lectures were a venue for the young Heidegger to boldly (if somewhat indirectly) confront the then-popular phenomenology of his mentor. No one who attends to them misses their critical attitude and import in this regard. Their content, however, is much more easily missed. What Husserl was accused of is not at all obvious, even when Heidegger was at his most direct. So it is my difficult task presently, to try to convince you that Heidegger's variety of claims, in a variety of the Marburg lecture courses, fit a general form. In fact, I believe they do. Once we know what we are looking at the unified Heideggerian argument comes clearly, if somewhat slowly, into view.

Let me begin with one of the later, more synoptic passages. Some of Heidegger's final lectures at Marburg were on the *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* (1928), which did not take Husserl and intentionality as their central topic, but nevertheless mentioned Husserl's account of consciousness as part of Heidegger's broader discussion of the essence of truth:

Husserl brought the problem out of these straits with his concept of intentional consciousness in the fifth of the *Logical Investigations* (volume 2). He prepares a new stage, insofar as he shows that intentionality determines the essence of consciousness

completely, the essence of reason as such. With his doctrine of the immanent intentionality of the *cogitationes* he establishes at the same time the connection with the basic questions of modern philosophy since Descartes. But just as in Brentano the concept of the soul itself is left untouched, so also in Husserl, in his idealistic epistemology, the question about the entity constituted as consciousness is posed no further. The insight into intentionality does not go far enough to see that grasping this structure as the essential structure of Dasein must thereby revolutionize the whole concept of humanity. Only then does its central philosophical significance become clear.⁸

Like many passages from *Being and Time*, this is a deft summary of material that Heidegger had worked out in significantly greater detail in earlier lectures. The rhetorical elegance of passages like this one are contentious interpretive claims that take barely the tenor of criticism. But it is important for us to see that the commentary Heidegger provided offered more than a merely historical account of the development of the "philosophical problem" of intentionality, already present in Aristotle, and for which Husserl is celebrated as "prepare[ing] a new stage." Heidegger thereby advertised his own works' revolutionary significance, situating Husserl as a necessary step in the progression that would lead inexorably to "revolutionize[ing] the whole concept of humanity." Husserl is sincerely praised (on my reading) for his "insight into intentionality," but that praise sets the stage for Heidegger's principal criticism: despite Husserl's breakthrough he did not go far enough, i.e. he was still mired in a bad, old metaphysical tradition. Husserl's work was supposed to have been flawed, ultimately and ironically, in exactly the way that Brentano's had been before him: where Brentano left the

concept of the soul "untouched," neglecting the investigation into the kind of entity that the soul was supposed to be, Husserl similarly failed to investigate the "entity constituted as consciousness." Brentano and Husserl remained in the orbit of modern philosophy, i.e. philosophy supposedly under the baleful influence of Descartes.⁹

The definitive formulation of this charge, leveled against Husserlian phenomenology, was already full-blown in the lectures that Heidegger had given in the summer semester of 1925, now preserved as the *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*. There the criticism of phenomenology, and of Husserl in particular, is presented as an "immanent critique."¹⁰ Heidegger aligned himself with the phenomenological movement, and thereby represented his revolt as arising from within it. That rhetorical alignment was not only rhetorical and political, but came packaged with a serious theoretical criticism: according to Heidegger the new phenomenologists had not only failed to accomplish their goals, but had so far failed to accomplish the very task that they had assigned to themselves.

The critical consideration shows: *phenomenological research is also under the spell of an old tradition, especially when it comes to the most original determination of its characteristic theme, intentionality. Against its own principle phenomenology determines its characteristic thematic objects, not from the things themselves, but rather from a traditional presupposition, albeit one which has become quite self-evident, the meaning of which ultimately lies in denying the original leap to its intended thematic entities [Seienden]. Phenomenology is thereby, in the basic task of determining its own field, unphenomenological! – which is to say, allegedly phenomenological! It is so in an even more fundamental sense. It is not merely the being [Sein] of the intentional and*

thus the being [*Sein*] of particular entities [*Seinenden*] which *remain undetermined, but categorial distinctions in entities [Seinden] are given* (consciousness and reality) *without clarifying, or even simply questioning the guiding respect* in which they are distinguished, which is just *that being [Sein] and its sense*.¹¹

Those are some seriously purple words: not just that "phenomenological research is under the spell of an old tradition" (bad enough!), but that "phenomenology is *unphenomenological!* – which is to say, [merely] *allegedly phenomenological!*" The phrase retains its rhetorical ring, even today. If we are to assess Heidegger's claim now, in the sobering light of hindsight, we must first know what phenomenology's "own-most" [*eigenstes*] principle was supposed to have been. And then we must know how phenomenology, in failing that particular principle, was supposed to have failed itself.

Heidegger tells us quite directly: phenomenology was supposed to have determined its own [*eigenstes*] field of study. Phenomenology, unlike the other philosophies preceding it, included the promise of an investigation that would determine its own "thematic objects" as a return to "the things themselves," i.e. would methodically reject any and all traditional prejudice regarding its appropriate topics of investigation. In Heidegger's view it was this promise of return *zu den Sachen selbst* (as opposed to the traditional presuppositions about them) that was phenomenology's most basic principle. And it is for this reason that phenomenologists, in particular, would be "unphenomenological" if they were to remain committed to traditional theoretical prejudices. In addition to being one of the preferred methods of historical criticism, the "immanent critique" poses a particular problem for

Husserlian phenomenology, insofar as Husserlian phenomenology had promised to be a presuppositionless philosophy.¹² It is one thing to promise a method of investigation that would determine its "own" objects of thematic investigation. It is quite another thing to sharpen the commitment of that promise into the claim that those objects would not be conceptualized in any traditional way.

Heidegger, on the other hand, interpreted the commitment of the famed phenomenological slogan quite differently.¹³ For Heidegger, the slogan "to the things themselves" meant the disclosure of those things' being. And for Heidegger that meant the ultimate revelation of Husserl's distinction between consciousness and its objects as a distinction between kinds of entities, i.e. a difference in the being of those entities.¹⁴ It is clear, thereby, that Heidegger meant to radicalize phenomenology itself, not only to depart from the way that phenomenology had been conceived by Husserl, but "radicalize" it in the more original sense of returning it to its roots. One of Heidegger's most famous and direct statements of Heidegger's own conceptualization of phenomenology was to be published only two years later, in the introduction of *Being and Time*: "As far as content goes, phenomenology is the science of the being of beings--ontology. In our elucidation of the tasks of ontology the necessity arose for a fundamental ontology which would have as its theme that being which is ontologically and ontically distinctive, namely Da-sein. This must be done in such a way that our ontology confronts the cardinal problem, the question of the meaning of being in general. From the investigation itself we shall see that the methodological meaning of phenomenological description is *interpretation*. The *logos* of the phenomenology of Da-sein has the charter of *hermeneuein*, through which the proper meaning of being and the basic structures of the very

being of Da-sein are *made known* to the understanding of being that belongs to Da-sein itself. Phenomenology of Da-sein is *hermeneutics* in the original signification of that word, which designates the work of interpretation."¹⁵

Did Husserl understand the success conditions for getting back to the things themselves in that particular way? Clearly not. And if Husserl did not himself believe, when he was distinguishing consciousness from its objects, that his success or failure turned upon discovering the being of those beings qua entities, would that undermine Heidegger's basic argument against him? It is important to acknowledge, from the start, that an assessment of Heidegger's argument against Husserl must extend to Husserl's own conceptualization, as much as it concerns whether Husserl made ontological presuppositions or neglected ontological investigations, insofar as any "immanent critique" will turn on facts about what a particular philosopher accepted as his or her goals, as much as it will on the assessment of whether those goals were met. We should take seriously, I suggest, Heidegger's claim to have provided an "immanent criticism" of Husserlian phenomenology.

I have thusfar referred to that criticism with Heidegger's own phrase, "neglect of the question of being [*Versäumnisses der Seinsfrage*]." But there are actually a variety of accusations woven into that single charge. One possible claim is that Husserl did not ever ask critical questions about the kind of entity that he himself conceived as consciousness. Another possible claim is that Husserl did not make the being of the entity conceived as consciousness the central theme of his investigations. Whichever of those is the more appropriate interpretation of Heidegger's meaning, each must be carefully distinguished from the claim that Husserl never asked critical questions about the kind of entity that he posited as the object of

consciousness, or the claim that he never made the being of the objects of consciousness the central theme of his investigations. Any of those four different accusations about neglecting consciousness or its objects makes up a "first strand" of Heideggerian critique that I will henceforth call *the simple neglect accusation*.

There is a second strand of Heideggerian criticism, distinct from any of those just mentioned. Heidegger additionally claimed, throughout his Marburg years, that Husserl had adopted the distinction of consciousness from objects uncritically. According to Heidegger, Husserl's concepts of *consciousness* and *intentional object* had their origins in a modern metaphysics of mind, particularly in Descartes' treatment of two different kinds of *substance* as *res cogitans* and *res extensa*. According to Heidegger, the difference between consciousness and its objects was conceived by Husserl, however tacitly, as that difference between kinds of entities. And it is that claim, especially, that I will argue below is the key to the criticism in the Marburg lecture courses. Whereas the first strand of criticism was that Husserlian phenomenology does not tell us (or indeed even care about!) the kinds of entities party to the intentional "relation,"¹⁶ the second strand of criticism is that the distinction between consciousness and its objects is always already, in virtue of its place in our modern tradition, a distinction between kinds of entities, i.e. a distinction taken over uncritically from the traditional metaphysics of mind. I will call this second strand of criticism *the presupposition accusation*.

It is important that these two (at least!) strands of Heideggerian criticism be recognized, i.e. recognized distinctly, despite the fact that they are always interwoven in Heidegger's lectures. The first accusation is that Husserl simply did not consider the being of the entities that he presupposed, the second is that he uncritically adopted an understanding of that being,

and hence of those entities, from the traditional philosophy of mind. When Heidegger wrote and spoke about the "neglect of the question of being" he meant both. Perhaps, for Heidegger, presupposing something about being requires neglecting critical questions about it, or neglecting critical questions about being is tantamount to presupposing something about it or the entities it characterizes. Let us even say that it is so, loosely speaking. But more precisely conceived, the simple neglect accusation and the presupposition accusation are non-identical. At the very least we can neglect things that we do not presuppose. For example, I can claim that Heidegger neglected, but did not presuppose, the distinction between presupposition and neglect. Heidegger himself did not crisply distinguish the two notions, but we must, if we are to understand their relationship and assess the quality of Heidegger's argument against Husserl. It is only after unraveling the two strands of criticism that we will discover whether Heidegger's argument required that they both be strong, or whether its rhetorical strength is phony, having come from their conflation.

3. The Simple Neglect Accusation

Heidegger could not have been claiming that Husserl never once asked a critical question about the being of the entities conceived as the objects of consciousness. For one thing, that claim is demonstrably false; there are many places where Husserl explicitly discussed the being of such entities, and Heidegger surely knew them.¹⁷ Husserl wrote that it does not matter what kind of being the objects of consciousness possess.¹⁸ The being of *intentional objects* is supposed by him to be variable: sometimes real, sometimes ideal, sometimes non-existent. Husserl's primary concern was not with the investigation of such differences as

distinctions between kinds of entities, but he at the very least he considered the being of the objects of consciousness, if only to deny its import for phenomenology.¹⁹ Despite the basic denial, the principal distinction of Husserl's breakthrough work was, in fact, a distinction between two kinds of entity, real and ideal. Husserl called this an "internal splitting of the conceptual unity of being (or what is the same: of the object *überhaupt*),"²⁰ and conceived it in roughly Platonic fashion: the real "thing-like entity" exists in time, as opposed to the ideal *Species* that possesses atemporal "being." By the time that Heidegger had become Husserl's assistant in Freiburg, Husserl had replaced the ideal *Species* with his technical notion of *noemata*, but the *transcendental phenomenology* of *Ideas I* continued to thematize the being of the objects of consciousness as "being characteristics" of what Husserl eventually came to call "*noesis*."²¹ So even if Heidegger's criticism was that Husserl failed to make the being of the objects of consciousness thematically central to his work, that criticism would still miss the mark, if somewhat less widely and wildly.

A better reading of the simple neglect accusation would be that Heidegger accused Husserl, not of neglecting the question of the being of the objects of consciousness, but of neglecting the question concerning the being of consciousness itself. Perhaps it was the being of consciousness itself that was not Husserl's "central theme" or "primary question." While Husserl advanced explicit claims about the concept of being, generally, perhaps Husserl did not explicitly raise questions about the being of the entity conceived as consciousness? That interpretation of Heidegger's accusation would indeed strike somewhat closer to the mark. In fact, it would still not be a bull's-eye.²² But for the sake of argument here, let us here simply grant to Heidegger the truth of the claim that the "character of being of consciousness was

simply not Husserl's primary question."

In that case we would find a compelling criticism of Husserl, but only to the extent that we had agreed to treat ontology as first philosophy. The understanding of ontology as a particularly privileged mode of inquiry is not exclusively Heideggerian. It was not developed by him through strenuous phenomenological attention to things themselves, but inherited by him from the ancient Greeks. If we have also come to believe, as Heidegger and the ancients did, that ontological inquiries are "prior to" or "more fundamental than" other sorts of human inquiry, then we may believe that every account of something presupposes an account of the being of that thing, and hence that any bare Husserlian account of consciousness (even "transcendental consciousness") would, by itself, be incomplete. We would then be especially unsympathetic to Husserl's claims to "metaphysical neutrality," and be highly suspicious of his method of *phenomenological reduction*. If ontology were first philosophy, then we would be generally sympathetic to the first strand of Heidegger's argument and would interpret any Husserlian silence about consciousness qua entity, i.e. any account of consciousness without a correlative account of the being of that consciousness, fundamentally incomplete, if not ultimately doomed.

But why should ontology be so privileged? After all, physicists do physics without making the being of physical entities their central concern. Musicologists study music without concern for the being of the musical entities. Limnologists study fresh water ecosystems without interrogating it as to its "character of being." Physicists, musicologists, limnologists need only be concerned with the physical, the musical, or the riparian, respectively, and as such. Why should phenomenology be different? To be sure, phenomenology was conceived by

Husserl himself as quite different. Husserl reserved for phenomenology an especially privileged place, i.e. the place of the fundamental science responsible for securing the meaning of the knowledge claims produced through the other specialized sciences. But even if Husserl were correct about phenomenology's privileged status in regard to the other, non-phenomenological sciences, why should that commitment necessitate that phenomenology be a fundamental ontology? Heidegger himself (and Heideggerians subsequently) have forthrightly acknowledged the need to answer this question about the (supposed) necessity of phenomenology as ontology.²³ But no satisfactory answer has been forthcoming.²⁴

One of the better attempts to explain Heidegger on this point is Iain Thomson's. Thomson reconstructs Heidegger's conviction that ontology is the privileged form of phenomenological inquiry as three basic claims: "[1] that all the positive sciences presuppose an ontological posit... [2] that philosophy studies precisely that which the positive sciences take for granted: their ontological posits... [3] that the positive sciences' ontological posits guide the scientists' actual investigations."²⁵ The claim that ontology should be restored to its privileged place as "the Queen of all the sciences" (to quote Kant's more elegant expression) would thus turn on the claim that ontology investigates exactly what the other "positive" inquiries presuppose: the being of those other inquiries' entities. "Biology, for example, seeks to understand how living beings function. As biologists successfully accomplish this important task, they allow us to understand in ever greater detail the *logos* of the *bios*, the order and structure of living organisms. Nevertheless, Heidegger asserts, biology proper cannot tell us what life *is*. Of course, the biologist must have some understanding of what 'life' is, simply in order to be able to pick out the appropriate entities to study. Heidegger maintains, however,

that this ontological understanding of 'the kind of being which belongs to the living as such' is normally a presupposition rather than a result of the biologist's empirical investigations."²⁶

Thomson's analysis may be a faithful reproduction of Heidegger's own thinking on the matter. But it is not a satisfactory justification of Heidegger's claim that the question of being is "ontically necessary"²⁷ (let alone that fundamental ontology is "the Queen of all the sciences"), because even if it is the case that all "positive" sciences are unable to account for "what it is" that they investigate without recourse to ontology, and even if it is the case that those sciences are somehow "guided" by what they merely presume about the being of the entities they investigate, it is simply not the case that ontology is thereby unique vis-à-vis sciences or other modes of human inquiry. An ontology, for example, may equally well presuppose facts about how living beings function. And facts about the "order and structure of living organisms" may be presuppositions inexplicable without recourse to a proper biology. We should not, thereby, conclude that biology is "prior" to all ontologies, or that it is "the Queen of all philosophies." Some do, of course. But the point I hope to make here is merely about the dearth of justification for such an attitude. Thomson faithfully reproduces Heidegger's claim, his mere claim, that all philosophy is after being. But we should not confuse that claim for its justification.

I am not confident that an adequate justification will be forthcoming. However, even if I have not convinced you on that particular point, the consequence to be drawn for the present analysis is more modest. My conclusion here is merely that the simple neglect accusation against Husserl is only so good as the justification of Heidegger's presumption that phenomenology must be a fundamental ontology. Husserl, for one, did not share Heidegger's

understanding of the necessarily ontological character of phenomenology's return to the things themselves. And without a justification of ontology's special status in that regard, Heidegger's criticism of Husserl as simply neglecting the question of being, even in the sense that Husserl did not make the being of consciousness his central philosophical theme, is fundamentally unjustified. The simple neglect accusation is only so good as the (missing) additional argument that establishes that it is the being of what interests a researcher that ought to be thematized by him or her, i.e. that the being of the thing rather than the thing itself is what every philosophy is after.

4. The Presupposition Accusation

That is why it is the second strand of Heidegger's argument that is more promising, more compelling, and merits our closer scrutiny in the remainder of this paper. It is the presupposition accusation, and not merely the simple neglect accusation, that lies at the heart of Heidegger's critique. I say this because, even if an astute student of philosophy (i.e., someone familiar with the subtle differences in orientation of Husserlian and Heideggerian phenomenologies, despite their family resemblance, and someone who remains unprejudiced in his or her judgment between them) were to remain unimpressed by the simple neglect accusation, he or might still give credence to the Heideggerian claim that Husserl had uncritically adopted elements of a traditional metaphysics, despite the promise to make phenomenology into a presuppositionless philosophy.

Heidegger himself was clearly aware that Husserl at least considered the distinction between consciousness and its objects as a distinction in being. He directly quoted Husserl

doing so in his Marburg lecture course entitled *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (1927):

It is next necessary for us to see in which way the modern philosophy conceives this distinction between subject and object, particularly, how subjectivity is characterized. This distinction between subject and object is spread throughout the problems of the modern philosophy and even reaches into the development of contemporary phenomenology. Husserl says in his *Ideas of Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy*, "The doctrine of categories must proceed from this most radical of all distinctions of being – being *as consciousness* [i.e. *res cogitans*] and being as what is '*witnessed*' in consciousness, 'transcendent' being [i.e. *res extensa*]." Husserl, *Ideen Bd. I*, p. 174. "Between consciousness [*res cogitans*] and reality [*res extensa*] yawns a veritable vorago of meaning." *a. a. O.*, p. 117. Husserl continually refers to this distinction, and exactly in the form in which it had been expressed in Descartes: *res cogitans – res extensa*.²⁸

Why would Heidegger have chosen to quote this passage, one of the few places that Husserl explicitly discussed the "relation" between consciousness and its object as an ontological difference? Why wouldn't Heidegger instead have ignored a passage like this one, and trumpeted all the more loudly his own ontological originality? The answer to that question is the crux of my argument here: this passage from *Ideen I* is not quoted to establish the central theme of Husserl's work, but instead to showcase Husserl as having committed himself to a distinction between consciousness and object as a difference between kinds of entities. Heidegger was attempting to show, not that this difference was in fact a difference between

kinds of entities, but rather that Husserl himself had conceived it that way, despite his having not followed through on that (his own) ontological commitment.

The quotation showcases Husserl as having treated consciousness and its object exactly as Descartes had, as "*res cogitans*" and "*res extensa*." The characteristically Cartesian language is supposed to establish, not merely that Husserl was part of the Cartesian tradition, but that the Cartesian presupposition amounted to --in Husserl's own words-- treating consciousness and its objects ontologically. However, upon returning to Husserl's original text, i.e. to this very passage from which Heidegger is "quoting," one finds conspicuously absent any Cartesian language, and particularly conspicuously absent the language of the "*res cogitans*" or "*res extensa*."²⁹ Those phrases have simply been added, presumably by Heidegger himself, and presumably to maximize his criticism's rhetorical effectiveness.³⁰ The Cartesian language is supposed to be the final nail in Husserl's coffin, but it turns out that Heidegger himself had to provide the nails.

Closer inspection of the Marburg lectures reveals a variety of passages where Heidegger sought, not merely to uncover the ontological presuppositions of Husserlian phenomenology, but also to construe its aims as ontological. A similar claim can be found already advanced in the *History of the Concept of Time* lecture course from 1925:

Obviously, the determination [of phenomenology's proper objects of study] aims at a determination of being. Consciousness is bluntly described as a region of absolute being, and further it is that very region from which all other entities (reality, transcendent entities) are demarcated. Furthermore, it is from within just this distinction, characterized

as the *most radical distinction of being*, that the doctrine of categories can and must be made.³¹

Why would Heidegger have concerned himself with establishing Husserl's (and not merely his own) ontological orientation? It was not merely a gross mischaracterization of Husserlian phenomenology's aims (as ontological), but exactly that gross mischaracterization necessary to formulate an "immanent criticism" of the phenomenological enterprise. Heidegger did not consider it sufficient to establish that Husserl had, however uncritically, adopted elements of the Cartesian metaphysics. Heidegger wanted, additionally, to show that Husserl had done so while proclaiming out of the other side of his mouth the task of phenomenology as the elucidation of the "most radical of all distinctions of being." This was because Husserl's presumption of some element or other of a Cartesian metaphysics would not, by itself, have been backsliding regarding the very thematic objects that phenomenology was supposed to have determined for itself (but had instead simply inherited from Descartes). It was particularly because getting at the things themselves meant rejecting any and all traditional presuppositions about them, when that is being understood in the Heideggerian (but not Husserlian!) way, i.e. as a rejection of presuppositions about the being of the entities treated as consciousness and objects of consciousness, that Husserl's having had Cartesian metaphysical presuppositions would have made Heidegger's "immanent criticism" successful.

Husserl's intended point was obviously not the claim that the distinction between consciousness and its objects is a distinction between kinds of entities (the point Heidegger attempted to hang on him, and him on.) Husserl's point in this passage was instead about the

generality of transcendental consciousness as such. Despite his characteristically unfortunate choice of language ("the most radical of all distinctions in being!")³² Husserl did not mean to account for the difference as fundamentally ontological. Rather, he intended to say that the latter "are rooted in [*wurzeln*]" the former.³³ The central claim of this easily abused passage is that transcendental consciousness is the "*Urkategorie*" from which all distinctions amongst entities themselves must be drawn. Heidegger read the passage aloud to his classroom in 1927 (with his own additions in the square brackets, presumably), attempting to prove that Husserl's distinction between consciousness and its objects was meant by Husserl himself as a distinction in being. But that is almost exactly opposite the meaning that Husserl had intended: that entities, no matter what sort of being they may (or may not) possess, have that being only insofar as they are "rooted" in transcendental consciousness.

Despite Heidegger's questionable scholarly practices, he was irreproachably correct in identifying Husserlian phenomenology as broadly Cartesian in character. That is especially the case for Husserl's work after the *Logical Investigations*.³⁴ Descartes' influence on Husserl's later philosophy was no secret, and Husserlian phenomenology would, by 1929 at the latest, owe a great debt to Descartes.³⁵ Despite that fact there are many other things about Husserlian phenomenology, especially the earliest Husserlian phenomenology, that were not particularly Cartesian.³⁶ So any careful analysis of the presupposition accusation must conclude with an assessment of whether Husserl uncritically adopted precisely those elements of a Cartesian metaphysics of mind that his phenomenology had meant to criticize or replace. If not a description of the difference between consciousness and its objects as a difference between the *res cogitans* and *res extensa*, then to what particular Cartesianism was Husserl supposedly

committed, despite its having been retrograde?

5. Husserl's Relapse, Whence and Whither

In the passages above Heidegger sought to connect Husserl's project to traditional presuppositions about the being of consciousness. But even if that general point were established it would be a far cry from establishing either that the construal those entities was false or in some other way objectionable (rather than merely traditional), let alone contrary to the aims of Husserlian phenomenology. The advantage of the present analysis is that we may begin to see through the powerful rhetoric of Heidegger's argument to the demands of its logical structure. Importantly, for any genuinely immanent critique: that very thing to which Husserl committed himself must be what he is shown to have failed to achieve. It is not enough for Heidegger to have claimed that Husserl had some affinity or other with Descartes. Of course Husserl had such an affinity, in some way or another. For Heidegger to have actually had a good argument against Husserl, he must additionally exhibit some more specific Husserlian Cartesianism as unphenomenological.

On the subject of Husserl's most damnable Cartesianism, Heidegger had more than merely one thing to say. The "immanent critique" of the lecture course of 1925 listed four basic ways that the Husserlian concept of consciousness was indebted to Descartes rather than to the "the things themselves." Husserl there is supposed to have treated consciousness as (1) immanent, (2) absolutely given, (3) constitutive of reality, and (4) ideally pure.³⁷ But close reading will also reveal that each of those four "determinations of pure consciousness [*Bestimmungen des reinen Bewußtseins*]" were in turn supposed to have had their origin in a

single source.

Husserl's primary question is simply not about the character of being [*Seinscharakter*] of consciousness, he is guided more by the consideration: *How can consciousness become the possible object of an absolute science?* The principal idea which guides him is the *idea of an absolute science*. This idea, that *consciousness should be a region of an absolute science*, is not simply invented, it is the idea which has occupied *modern philosophy* since Descartes. The development of pure consciousness as the thematic field of phenomenology is *not gained phenomenologically by returning to the things themselves*, but rather by returning to a traditional idea of philosophy.³⁸

Here, characteristically, we find the two strands of Heideggerian criticism interwoven. The simple neglect accusation, i.e. "Husserl's primary question is not about the character of the being of consciousness," is closely followed by the presupposition accusation: "This idea, that *consciousness should be a region of an absolute science*, is not simply invented, it is the idea which has occupied modern philosophy since Descartes." But we also find here a key detail regarding the content of the most fateful and fatal presupposition: consciousness was treated by Husserl as (5) "the possible object of an absolute science."

That last claim had been worked out in Heidegger's earliest Marburg lectures, which not coincidentally presented his most detailed and direct criticisms of Husserl, and have now been preserved (and recently translated) as the *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* (1923-24). They begin with "Husserl's Self-Interpretation of Phenomenology," "Return to Descartes and the Scholastic Ontology that Determines Him," and then conclude by "Demonstrating the

Neglect of the Question of Being as a Way of Pointing to Dasein." There we see the basic form of Heidegger's Marburg argument against Husserl, expressed neatly in the table of contents. It is deeply ironic that this lecture course should contain one of the best accounts of the fundamental differences between the Husserlian and Cartesian treatments of consciousness extant, insofar as it ultimately insists upon identifying them.

...The act of the cogito sum and its certitudo are nevertheless alive in Husserl in a much more fundamental sense, such that it comes here *less than ever* to an *explicit inquiry* into the character of being [*Seinscharakter*] of consciousness. Instead all interest is diverted straight to building a fundamental science and to considering the entity from the outset in regard to its suitability as the theme of this fundamental science. Being [*Sein*] in the sense of a *region of being* [*Region-Seins*] for science misplaces more than ever the possibility of letting the entity be encountered in its character of being.

This tendency (grounded in the dominance of today's idea of science) must be *reversed*, insofar as it is necessary to see that this point of departure is not original. The concept of consciousness is in fact simply adopted by Husserl from Cartesian psychology and Kantian epistemology.³⁹

On Heidegger's account the concept of consciousness, taken over from Descartes (not to mention Kant!), amounted to presuming that the entity so conceptualized would be the object of a scientific investigation, rather than something encountered in its own "character of being." On Heidegger's account such a conception is infected with (6) the "care about certainty"⁴⁰ characteristic of Descartes' well-known epistemological project. In turn, that epistemic

orientation, and hence the scientific knowledge that results from it, was in three different ways described by Heidegger as "disfiguring [*verunstalten*]."⁴¹ Intentionality was then treated as (7) fundamentally theoretical in character rather than practical; emotional experiences (like loving, hating, etc.) were recognized only as kinds of knowing, especially insofar as those were treated as (8) based upon representations [*Vorstellungen*]. Evidence was then conceived by Husserl (particularly in *Logical Investigations VI*, we might observe) as (9) the *coincidence* of what is meant (or intended) with what is intuitively grasped, i.e. as something other than access to being in the disclosure of a particular entity. Inappropriate categories were then applied to the entity conceived as consciousness, particularly (10) the categories of *genus* and *species*, and particularly insofar as those suggested a *mathesis universalis*, i.e. a generalized experience capable of being investigated scientifically.⁴²

In this brief backward glance we have been able to glimpse a wide variety in the details of Heidegger's attribution of Cartesianisms to Husserl, and perhaps even a significant change in them between the years 1924 to 1925. The heart of Husserl's problem, however, was supposed to have remained the same, and was expressed consistently throughout Heidegger's Marburg years. According to Heidegger it was the conceptualization of consciousness itself, expressed in any (or each) of the ten ways, that was the core Husserlian problem. "Accordingly, through the supposition of consciousness as the thematic field of phenomenological research in the genuine sense, what every philosophy is after is misplaced and distorted [*verstellt*]."⁴³ The most fateful and fatal mistake Edmund Husserl inherited from Descartes, according to Martin Heidegger, was the conceptualization of phenomenology's proper thematic object as the scientific study of consciousness.

6. Conclusion

None of the aforementioned "Cartesianisms" (1)-(10) would make Heidegger's "imminent criticism" successful. The foregoing analysis should by now have revealed its basic flaw. To see that flaw clearly we might simply grant one of the ten "Cartesianisms" without further qualification. That would not, in every case, produce a straightforwardly true claim.⁴⁴ But let us simply grant one for the sake of argument. Still, Husserl's reply, in that case or the nine others, could be that he had not repudiated the doctrine ascribed to him. His ready reply, in each case, should be that Heidegger's argument against him is an *ignoratio elenchi*.

This possible Husserlian rejoinder is neatly expressed, if not endorsed, by Taylor Carman: "One might reply that Heidegger's critique of Husserl is surely misguided, since it was never the purpose of the phenomenological reductions or the description of pure consciousness to raise the question of *being* in the first place. Indeed, it was precisely the point of the eidetic reduction to bracket that question in favor of an examination of the structure of intentionality, quite apart from its manifestation in concrete psychological episodes. Heidegger's critique is tendentious and irrelevant in attending to the putative ontological prejudices underlying Husserl's account, one might argue, since pure phenomenology is ontologically neutral. Perhaps Heidegger's 'immanent critique' is not immanent at all, then, but wholly external to the interests animating Husserl's theory."⁴⁵ Indeed! That should be our conclusion. Carman himself does not endorse this conclusion because, with Heidegger, he believes that abstracting from "concrete psychological episodes" is abandoning the very essence of phenomenology. I think that is fair enough to claim, if "phenomenology" must be understood in the peculiarly

Heideggerian fashion. But if we are to complain that "Husserl performs the reductions precisely by ignoring the fundamental question concerning the being of the entity endowed with intentionality to begin with,"⁴⁶ then we must either present an argument that establishes that inquiry into the being of such entities is necessary, or we must relinquish the claim that Husserl's failure to perform it is in any way a criticism of Husserl.

On Heidegger's reading, Husserl meant to treat the distinction between consciousness and its objects as a distinction in being, i.e. a distinction between kinds of entities. That is because phenomenology itself, on Heidegger's understanding, was a promise and commitment to inquiry into being. Heidegger's disappointment in his teacher was that Husserl, rather than return to the things themselves and exhibit them in their "character of being," instead conceived them under metaphysical concepts that he had uncritically inherited from Descartes. The result was Husserl's preoccupation with knowledge and certainty (a distinctively modern proclivity), manifested most obviously in his desire to make consciousness the study of a strict science. The result of Husserl's presupposition about the being of consciousness (according to Heidegger) was the reproduction of the characteristically modern blindness to the concrete being of the entities under investigation, a presupposition that distorted Husserl's account of the ways that such entities actually appear to us, i.e. in practical experiences of everyday *Dasein*.

I have a sincere appreciation for the interesting elements of that story, and do not mean to deny the parts of it that are true. However, this paper has shown that it also involves a basic confusion that precludes sound argument against Husserl. We may grant Heidegger's claim that "the character of being of consciousness was simply not Husserl's primary question." But then we may not acknowledge Husserlian failure on that point, insofar as the necessity of the account

of the character of being of consciousness has neither been antecedently established, nor drew Husserl's explicit rejection. Perhaps Husserl was simply wrong about something (perhaps a great many things!), and perhaps those things were directly inherited from Descartes. But even in that circumstance there would be no "immanent critique." Primarily, we must not confuse a claim about what Husserl simply neglected (let us say, an account of the being of consciousness) with a claim about what he presupposed (let us say, an account of the being of consciousness). But secondarily, we must not confuse a mere presupposition for a philosophical failing.

In this paper I have not defended Husserl against any of the particular charges of Cartesianism, i.e. I have not addressed in detail the truth or falsity of any of Heidegger's claims (1)-(10), articulated in the previous section. What I have chosen to highlight instead is that Heidegger did not merely claim that Husserl's "Cartesian" account of consciousness "misplaced and distorted" the things themselves (as Heidegger construed them). Heidegger additionally claimed that Husserl "misplaces and distorts for himself what he wants [*was er will, sich selbst verstellt*]." ⁴⁷ Such remarks were not throw-away comments. They can be found throughout Heidegger's Marburg lectures, and they are significant because they are required for the "immanent criticism" of the sort that Heidegger thought was especially at issue for Husserlian phenomenology. Heidegger naturally thought that what Husserl wanted is what "every philosophy is after," i.e. an account of the being of consciousness and its objects. But we should remain highly suspicious that there is any one thing that every philosophy is after.

There is, nevertheless, a broader conclusion to be drawn for the prospects of Husserlian phenomenology. We should be tentative in any move toward this broader conclusion, because

the present paper has merely established that Heidegger's Marburg argument was not an immanent criticism. However, here at its completion I find that I have also been impressed by the sheer number of "Cartesianisms" Heidegger was able to identify in Husserl's work. Those listed above were only ten most easily accessible to me. I am sure that there are others to be found in Heidegger's writings, and elsewhere. The number and their plausibility suggest that Husserlian phenomenology was far from presuppositionless. Indeed, it would be committed to significant presupposition if even one of those (many) charges were true. What this suggests to me, at least, is that Husserl's so-called "principle of freedom from presupposition" is doomed, and that phenomenology's future lies in the *hermeneutic* method made famous by *Being and Time*. In saying that, however, I must quickly add that a hermeneutic phenomenology, despite Heidegger's work, need not involve a fundamental ontology. Even if you take Heidegger's argument to have shown that phenomenology is not presuppositionless, it would not thereby prove it to be ontological. To return to the question at the origin of this brief investigation, *consciousness* and *intentionality*, conceived with an appropriate degree of hermeneutic sophistication and humility, need not be objectionable, ontologically or otherwise. Heidegger simply confuses the hermeneutic with the ontological: but that is a topic for another occasion.

The rhetorical power of Heidegger's Marburg argument derives from two distinct sources. It comes from the fact that Heidegger appeared to make an immanent critique of Husserlian phenomenology, i.e. a criticism adopting Husserl's own presuppositions and methods in order to show how Husserl's project failed to meet its own goals, when measured by its own standards. And it comes from the conflation of presupposition with simple neglect. But Heidegger's critique was not an immanent critique, for the reasons that I have given above.

And while it may be true that Husserl did not make the being of consciousness (as opposed to consciousness itself) the central theme of his investigations, that is a far cry from establishing either that he presupposed consciousness as the Cartesian *res cogitans*, or that it would have been objectionable if he had. I have not shown that Husserlian phenomenology is superior to Heideggerian phenomenology. I have not shown that Heideggerian phenomenology is not superior to Husserlian phenomenology. Neither have I shown that there isn't good Heideggerian argument to be made against Husserl, nor that phenomenology as conceived by Husserl wasn't "unphenomenological," as conceived by Heidegger. What I have shown is that this was hardly Heidegger's claim. I have shown that Husserlian phenomenology was not "unphenomenological," when we hold the meaning of the term 'phenomenological' fixed. Heidegger's Marburg argument against Husserl fails to cut the mustard, because under no circumstances may we accept an insinuation of guilt by association, even when it may be the very real association with one of history's most notorious metaphysical dualists, as meeting the standards of an immanent critique.⁴⁸

¹ Fred Olafson. *Heidegger and the Philosophy of Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987, p. 3.

² The lecture courses Heidegger gave at the University of Marburg from 1923-1928 are now published as volumes 17-26 of Martin Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1976-. I will quote from their English translations, except where otherwise noted.

³ An equally important source, though I will not address it here, is their abortive co-authoring of the "phenomenology" entry for the 1929 Encyclopedia Britannica. See Edmund Husserl. *Collected Works VI: Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology and the Confrontation with Heidegger (1927-1931)*. Translated

by Thomas Sheehan and Richard Palmer. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.

⁴ For important work establishing this consensus see Steven Galt Crowell. *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning: Paths toward Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2001, p. 172: "Heidegger does not object here to Husserl's move toward a transcendental phenomenology, to 'transcendental subjectivity' as such. Instead, he indicates the locus of a disagreement over how this field of transcendent subjectivity (or 'transcendental life,' as Husserl calls it) is to be interpreted." See also Dermot Moran. "Heidegger's Critique of Husserl's and Brentano's Accounts of Intentionality," in *Inquiry*, v. 43, 2000, pp. 39-66. Moran's basic thesis is that "Heidegger is *developing* Husserl, focusing in particular on the ontological dimension of intentionality, not *reversing* or *abandoning* his account" (p. 39.) See also Burt Hopkins' *Intentionality in Husserl and Heidegger: The Problem of the Original Method and Phenomenon of Phenomenology*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. Hopkins argues: "...what is at issue for Husserl, with the progressive reflective unfolding of the constitutional essences of the natural attitude and its correlative thesis of the world, is isomorphic with Heidegger's reawakening of the question about the meaning of Being on the basis of the *Seinsverständnis* manifested by Dasein's essential composition as being-in-the-world" (p. 185.) See also Ernst Tugendhat. *Der Wahrheitsbegriff bei Husserl und Heidegger*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1967, S. 263: "Gerade durch die Epoché betritt also Husserl die Dimension von Heideggers In-der-Welt-Sein."

⁵ Notable dissent from the consensus can be found in Taylor Carman's *Heidegger's Analytic: Interpretation, Discourse and Authenticity in Being and Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, especially pp. 57-63.

⁶ For this basic insight I am indebted to Joe Shear, though he may not approve of my interpretation here.

⁷ Martin Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe Bd. 56, 57: Zur Bestimmung der Philosophie* [1919]. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1987. As translated and quoted in Carman, *Heidegger's Analytic*, p. 71.

⁸ Martin Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe Bd. 26: Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1978, S. 167. Translated by Michael Heim as *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, p. 133. The translation of this passage is Heim's with my minor modifications.

⁹ The most basic accusation, that Husserlian phenomenology neglects the "question about the entity constituted as consciousness," was not only leveled at Husserl and Brentano, but at all of modern philosophy, insofar as modern philosophy is supposedly Cartesian in character. Heidegger had advanced the claim that it was Descartes who first "neglected" the question concerning the being of consciousness several years earlier, for example, in his lectures on *The History of Philosophy from Thomas Aquinas to Kant* (1926/27). "With Descartes modern philosophy can take a fundamentally new beginning and approach: orientation toward the subject. What does that mean? With this turning toward the subject does the ontological determination of these entities [*Seienden*], the *res cogitans*, also arise? In no way. In connection with this change are questions about being [*Sein*] at all being asked? In no way. Is the relationship between truth and being [*Sein*] at all brought to clarification, or merely even questioned? In no way." Martin Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe, Bd. 23: Geschichte der Philosophie von Thomas von Aquin bis Kant*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2006, S. 137 ff. My translation. For the purposes of this paper I will set aside Heidegger's broader claim that (all!?) modern philosophy conceives the subject in a fundamentally Cartesian way in order to focus on the narrower task of explaining the "neglect of the question of being" particularly as it is deployed as an argument against Husserl. For a more detailed account of Heidegger's relationship to Descartes see Jean-Luc Marion, "Heidegger and Descartes," in *Critical Heidegger*. Edited by Christopher Macann. London and New York: Routledge, 1996, pp. 67-96.

¹⁰ This is in fact the title of §11, "Immanent Critique of Phenomenological Research."

¹¹ Martin Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe, Bd. 20: Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*. Herausgegeben von Petra Jaeger. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1979, S. 178. Translated by Theodore Kisiel as *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992, pp. 128, 29. Hereafter cited as *GA20*. The translation of this passage is Kisiel's with my minor modifications.

¹² For Husserl's commitment to the "principle of freedom from presupposition," see Edmund Husserl. *Logische Untersuchungen*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1900, 01, Einleitung Bd. 2, §7. Translated by J.N. Findlay as *Logical Investigations*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970. Hereafter cited as *LU*. Or see Edmund Husserl. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie, I. Buch: Allgemeine Einführung in*

die reine Phänomenologie. Halle an der Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1913, §§18, 63. Translated by F. Kersten as *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: First Book*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1983. Hereafter cited as *Ideen I*.

¹³ In locating the core of their dispute in the meaning of "*die Sachen selbst*," and thereby their conceptualizations of phenomenology, I here follow Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. *Hermeneutik und Reflexion: Der Begriff der Phänomenologie bei Heidegger und Husserl*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000. See especially pp. 101-15.

¹⁴ In this paper I use four different Heideggerian phrases, "distinction in being," "difference in being," "distinction between kinds of entities," and "difference between kinds of entities," all synonymously. I do this despite the fact that not every difference between entities is a distinction in being. The many differences between two different kinds of tool, for example, are not differences in being. The most fundamental difference between a *Dasein* and a *Zuhandensein*, however (following Heidegger), is a difference between kinds of entities, i.e. a distinction "in being." I should point out that Heidegger denies that the latter difference is a distinction "in kind," at least as conceived under the logic of traditional Aristotelian categories. See Martin Heidegger. *Sein und Zeit: Erste Hälfte*. Halle an der Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1927, §7(c). Translated by Joan Stambaugh as *Being and Time*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996. Hereafter cited as *SZ*. One of Heidegger's lesser criticisms of Husserl and the tradition is that we do not recognize this fact about *kategoriai*. So readers may substitute "ways of being" or "modes of being" where I write "kinds of entities" if they prefer that greater fidelity to Heidegger's way of speaking. To my knowledge, nothing of substance for my argument will turn on this point.

¹⁵ *SZ* §7(c), Stambaugh's translation.

¹⁶ The scare quotes are here because Husserl, unlike Brentano, did not treat intentionality as a relation. For further discussion see Ryan Hickerson. *The History of Intentionality: Theories of Consciousness from Brentano to Husserl*. New York and London: Continuum, 2007, pp. 104-5, pp. 113-14.

¹⁷ E.g. *LU II* §8, *LU VI* §44, or almost the entirety of its *Prolegomena*. See especially the passage from *Ideen I* Heidegger himself cites in the quotation below.

¹⁸ See *LU V*, *Beliage zu den Paragraphen 11 und 20*.

¹⁹ For further discussion of this important interpretive point see Dan Zahavi, "Metaphysical Neutrality in *Logical Investigations*," in *One Hundred Years of Phenomenology: Husserl's Logical Investigations Revisited*. Edited by Dan Zahavi and Frederik Stjernfelt. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002, pp. 93-108. Or see Dan Zahavi. *Husserl's Phenomenology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003, p. 40.

²⁰ *LU II*, §8.

²¹ *Ideen I*, §103.

²² Consider, for example, Husserl's famous claim that "no real being... is necessary for the being of consciousness," and compare it with his claim that "immanent being is indubitably absolute being." *Ideen I*, §49. Set aside, for the moment, the issue of consistency, and notice that he hardly seemed to be neglecting the question.

²³ See *GA20*, S. 149 ff. (English p. 108). See also Carman, *Heidegger's Analytic*, pp. 93-4.

²⁴ The place to look for such an answer (and I have not given up looking myself!) is the Introduction to *Being and Time*, where Heidegger claims that the question of being is both *ontologically* (*SZ*, §3), and *ontically*, (*SZ*, §4) "prior" to other questions in philosophy and the special sciences. I must confess that I am still looking, especially for justification of the latter claim. My argument here is merely that until such evidence is strong, the first strand of Heidegger's argument against Husserl remains weak.

²⁵ Iain Thomson. *Heidegger on Ontotheology: Technology and the Politics of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 108-09.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

²⁷ *SZ*, S. 13 (English, p. 11).

²⁸ Martin Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe, Bd.24: Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975, S. 175 ff. Translated by Albert Hofstadter as *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988, pp. 124-25. Hereafter cited as *GA24*. The contents in the square brackets are in Heidegger's text. The translation is Hofstadter's with my minor modifications.

²⁹ The passage is *Ideen I*, S. 141 ff. (English p. 171), which I translate: "Through the phenomenological reduction we are given the realm of transcendental consciousness, which in a particular sense is a realm of

'absolute' being. It is the most basic category of being (or in our language, the most basic region), in which all other regions of being are rooted, are referred to their *essence*, and on which their essential nature depends. The doctrine of the categories must proceed from this most radical of all distinctions of being – being *as consciousness* and being as it is '*testified to*' in consciousness, 'transcendent' being – which, as one sees, can only be gained and appreciated through the method of the phenomenological reduction in its purity."

³⁰ It is important to remember that this text was originally a lecture course, assembled from notes almost fifty years after it was delivered. As Hofstadter points out in the preface to the English translation, the *Gesamtausgabe* edition does not make clear who was responsible for the citations and notes. We should extend that caution to judgments about the additions made to the text, I think.

³¹ *GA20*, S. 141 (English, p. 102). The addition in the square brackets is mine.

³² In fairness to Husserl, at the time of writing he could not possibly have foreseen the significance of more carefully characterizing stark differences between his phenomenology and that of his future erstwhile assistant.

³³ *Ideen I*, §49.

³⁴ References to Descartes in the *Investigations* are scant; Husserl is more clearly indebted to the empiricists. It is noteworthy that in one of the few places the *Investigations* does refer to Descartes by name the Cartesian treatment of experience as *cogitationes* is explicitly repudiated. See *LU*, Beilage §7.

³⁵ Consider one of Husserl's own proclamations shortly after Heidegger left Marburg: "No philosopher of the past has affected the sense of phenomenology as decisively as René Descartes, France's greatest thinker. Phenomenology must honor him as its genuine patriarch. It must be said explicitly that the study of Descartes' *Meditations* has influenced directly the formation of the developing phenomenology and given it its present [1929] form, to such an extent that phenomenology might almost be called a new, a twentieth century, Cartesianism." Edmund Husserl. *The Paris Lectures*. Translated by Peter Koestenbaum. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967, p. 3. When reading this passage one must, of course, keep open the question whether Husserl's understanding of "Cartesianism" was anything like Heidegger's.

³⁶ I am indebted to an anonymous *Inquiry* referee for directing my attention to one, a passage in Edmund

Husserl's *Cartesian Meditations* [1931]. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1977, p. 24, where Descartes is criticized for believing that he has "rescued a little tag-end of the world."

³⁷ See *GA20*, S. 142 ff. (English pp. 103-07).

³⁸ *GA20*, S. 147 (English, p. 107). This is Kisiel's translation with my minor modifications.

³⁹ Martin Heidegger. *Gesamtausgabe Bd. 17: Einführung in die Phänomenologische Forschung*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994, S. 270 ff. Translated by Daniel Dahlstrom as *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2005, p. 208. Hereafter cited as *GA17*. The translation of this passage is Dahlstrom's with my minor modifications.

⁴⁰ See *GA17*, §48.

⁴¹ Loc. cit.

⁴² While the argument in 1923-24 is obviously targeted at Husserl's position in the *Logical Investigations*, and the arguments of 1925 (and later) at Husserl's position in *Ideas I*, this last point is clearly reprised: Descartes and Husserl, throughout, are supposed to have treated consciousness abstractly, as a "pure being" fundamentally detached from the particularities of everyday experience. See *GA20*, S. 145 ff. (English, pp. 106-07).

⁴³ *GA17*, S. 274 (English p. 211). Dahlstrom's translation.

⁴⁴ I cannot establish this claim exhaustively here, but let me simply take (1) as a ready example. Heidegger claimed that both Descartes and Husserl treated consciousness as "immanent being." But according to the *Logical Investigations*, consciousness is conceived as a *mental act* composed of two kinds of mental content. One of these kinds of content, *reellen content*, was indeed treated by Husserl as "immanent," i.e. mind-dependent. But the other, *intentional content* was sometimes instantiated by *real* thing-like entities, sometimes by ideal *Species*, and sometimes by *intentional objects* that do not exist. By definition, every mental act was comprised not only of *reellen contents* but also *intentional contents*, and Husserl expressly denied that intentional contents were immanent. See *LU V*, Appendix to §11 and §20. So claiming that Husserl's account of consciousness was "immanence" is half right but half wrong, at least.

⁴⁵ Carman, *Heidegger's Analytic*, p. 93

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁴⁷ *GAI7*, S. 274 (English p. 211).

⁴⁸ For helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper I owe belated thanks to Eleanor Hickerson, Wayne Martin, and Jeff Yoshimi. I especially owe thanks to Wayne for the sheer number of times that he has been subjected to this material, in its many guises. I also benefited more recently, but to a great degree, from comments provided by two anonymous referees for *Inquiry*. They were unusually generous with their criticisms and advice.