

BURT C. HOPKINS*

Remarks on Appearing and Appearance in Husserl

1. *The Dialectical Context of Appearance in Plato*

In Plato the “*phainomenon*” occurs in the dialectical investigation of the unknown, the context of which is the mutual recognition in the souls of the interlocutors in a dialogue that the sought-after knowledge of what they are talking about is not in their possession. It thus means not simply “appearance” but more precisely the appearance in speech (*logos*) of what is sought after but recognized by the soul (at that moment, at least) to be unknown. In order for what is unknown to nevertheless show up as an appearance, speech must posit it as something already known, in the full knowledge that what is posited is only a supposition (*hypothesis*). The speech of a soul with knowledge of its ignorance is therefore the medium of appearance. Examples of appearances in Plato include virtue, piety, knowledge, being, false speech, Eros, beauty, the sophist, the statesman, etc. One consequence of the cognitive context of the Platonic *phainomenon* is that its truth status is initially necessarily in question, because as the appearance of what is sought-after and therefore unknown, it cannot be established at the outset whether what appears is a likeness (*eikon*) to what is sought-after or only its distorting semblance (*phantasma*). Eventually, it is established that the true sources (*archai*) of the manifestation of the visible appearances in perception (*phantasia*) and public opinion (*doxa*) are the appearances (*phainomena*) of invisible forms (*eidê*) in dialectical speech. Because complete knowledge of the *eidê* is not the provenance of mortals, however, separating their likeness from their semblance in their appearance is the work of a non-demonstrative science, namely, philosophy, understood as dialectic.

2. *The Incorrigible Status of Appearance in Aristotle*

In Aristotle, the appearance is initiated by sense perception (*aisthêsis*), which is posited as intrinsically true, in the sense of being the incorrigible reception of the intelligible form (*eidos*) of the being that is beyond the “porch” of the soul, whose action upon the soul leaves in it its lasting impression: the visible form (*morphê*) of the image (*phantasm*). As incorrigible, the content of the appearance is in complete fidelity with its eidetic source (*archê*) and therefore cannot be corrected vis-à-vis its origin. The medium of appearance is therefore exclusively the soul. Appearance, as the *phantasm* unmediated by *logos*, thus for Aristotle rules out semblance from the start. Moreover, in their function as the inseparable basis for knowledge of the *eide* of the beings external to the soul, the *phantasmata* rule out semblance from the appearances of the *eidê* in the soul as well. Investigation of the *eidê* is therefore the work of not only a demonstrative science, but the highest such science, first philosophy (*prôtê philosophia*), which investigates the sources (*archai*) and causes of the forms present in all things that have being (*ousia*).

* Université de Lille | UMR-CNRS 8163 STL

3. *Continuity and Departure from Plato and Aristotle of Appearance in Husserl*

Appearance in Husserl, like in Plato, initially occurs within a cognitive context, namely, the investigation of the source and legitimacy of the ideal units of meaning appealed to but unaccounted for by the science of knowledge's account of the foundations of mathematics and logic. However, like Aristotle, sense perception initiates the appearance in the soul, with the consequent impression, again like Aristotle, being incorrigible. The medium of the appearance is therefore exclusively the soul, which means that for Husserl like Aristotle, what appears is initially unmediated by *logos*. Moreover, in contrast to Plato, where the condition necessary for the appearance is the positing of the unknown in the guise of something already known, for Husserl, as for Aristotle, the condition necessary for the appearance is the impression left in the soul by the external object.

However, unlike in either Plato or Aristotle, for Husserl the soul's knowledge of the appearance is a function of its perceptual relation to itself, rather than a function of the *logos* of souls with a knowledge of their ignorance, as in Plato, or of a demonstrative science of the *archai* of the forms of things that have being, as in Aristotle. Husserl denominated the soul's perceptual self-relation reflection, which he misleadingly characterized as "inner intuition" or "inner perception"; misleadingly because it invited and continues to invite the misunderstanding that 'reflection' in Husserl's phenomenology means introspection. Introspection understood as the perception of the mind as an internal object in contrast to the perception of the object in external perception, the so-called external object. But despite Husserl's misleading terminology, from the *Logical Investigations* on it is clear that from the standpoint of his phenomenology the antithesis between inner and outer perception is «false»¹. Thus, he writes in the Appendix to the First Edition of the *LI*:

Having regard to the fact that all sorts of lived-experiences (including the lived-experiences of outer intuition, whose objects are therefore called *outer* appearances) can be made objects of reflective, inner intuition, we call all lived-experiences in an ego's experiential unity 'phenomena'. *Phenomenology* is accordingly the theory of lived-experiences in general, inclusive of all matters, whether intrinsic (*reellen*) or intentional, given in lived-experiences, and evidently discoverable in them.²

Here it is clear that by "reflective, inner intuition" Husserl does not mean the inner perception of his mentor Brentano, whose object is exclusively the psyche, let alone the introspection the British Empiricists, whose interiority is determined by the status of its object, the mind, as an inner object in contradistinction to the external status of the object of outer perception. This is to say, the inner direction of the phenomenological reflection in question is emphatically not determined by its opposition to the outer direction of external intuition. And this is what allows Husserl to say that even the lived-experience of outer intuition can be made the object of reflective, inner intuition. If the opposition to something external doesn't determine the inner characteristic of the reflection Husserl is talking about here, what, then, does? The answer is phenomenological evidence, understood as the immanence – of the lived-experience made into the object that appears in phenomenological reflection – to the intuitive regard of that reflection itself. What is immanent here is the phenomenon, which is to say, the appearance of the lived-experience in its multifaceted composition. What makes it immanent

¹ *LI*, p. 254.

² *Ivi*, p. 862.

is the methodical stance of the phenomenologist, which analyzes the object that appears to his or her reflective regard exclusively in terms of the scope and limits of that object's appearance to that regard³.

4. Heidegger's Notion of Phenomenon is Radically Distinct from Appearance in Husserl

It is important to note that Husserl's account of the phenomenon here, which articulates «the concept of what appears, or of what could appear, of the intuitive as such»⁴, must be sharply distinguished from Heidegger's account of the phenomenon in phenomenology in Section 7 of *Being and Time*. There Heidegger's notion of phenomenon takes its bearings from the Platonic formulation, which, we've seen, in addition to a likeness, can mean a distorting semblance. Heidegger stipulates, however, that the phenomenological concept of phenomenon excludes that of its "Greek" meaning as a semblance, and he therefore reserves for its meaning exclusively «that which shows itself in itself (*Sich-an-ihm-selbst-zeigende*)»⁵. He bases this stipulation on his claim that the phenomenon's meaning as semblance «is founded»⁶ on its meaning the manifest. His account of phenomenon is thus removed from the dialectical context of the Platonic meaning, in which, as we've seen, the very distinction between an appearance that is veridical (likeness) and distorting (semblance) is radically in question. Being in question, this distinction cannot be assumed to be in force and thus a matter of knowledge at

³ Jan Patočka's influential argument (2015), which claims that in Husserl's account of the appearance that which is responsible for its appearing, namely, the lived-experiences in which it appears, paradoxically do *not* appear, inexplicitly passes over in silence Husserl's account of precisely the appearance of lived-experiences articulated by Husserl and discussed here. Patočka's argument has its basis in two highly questionable interpretations of Husserl's account of what is involved in explicitly phenomenological access to the object's appearance. The first assumption is that the appearance of the object in external perception is paradigmatic of the appearance of all objects for Husserl. As will be shown below, by "object" Husserl's phenomenology means a stable identity in the flux of lived-experience. Thus, while the appearance of the object in outer perception no doubt satisfies this criterion, it does not do so exclusively (see below). The second assumption is that the dynamic relationship between straightforward givenness of an object and the reflective thematization of the lived-experience in which it is given, which characterizes natural reflection, is a dynamic that carries over into the phenomenological attitude and thus characterizes reflection in the phenomenologically proper sense. The problem with this assumption is that the very dynamic it articulates *presupposes* both the methodological stance of the phenomenologist and the appearance of the dynamic in question in the immanent evidence of that stance's reflective regard. This is to say, that this assumption conflates the natural meaning of reflection as inner perception, which is based on the opposition between inner and outer perception, with the phenomenological meaning of reflection, whose methodical regard, in this instance, is responsible for thematizing the very dynamic in question. That a thinker with the stature of Klaus Held has embraced (1981) the main thrust of Patočka's argument regarding the implications of the lack of access to the appearing responsible for the appearance in the initial unthematic givenness of lived-experience, speaks to the challenge Husserl's phenomenology presents to the basic opposition assumed by the natural attitude between inner and outer perception. The challenge, specifically, of not slipping back into that attitude's natural understanding of the distinction between inner and outer perception when articulating the phenomenal dynamic between thematic and unthematic modes of appearing within the phenomenological attitude. The articulation of the latter by the regard of phenomenologically methodical reflection is what is behind the claim about the non-appearance of the appearing of the lived-experiences responsible for the object's appearance. Methodologically, then, the non-appearance in question nevertheless appears in terms of its non-thematic mode of lived-experience. The appearance of what is non-thematic here is not in any way paradoxical. It only seems as such insofar as the natural meaning of reflection as initially unthematic – and therefore, non-appearing – inner perception remains operative in the phenomenological attempt to thematize the dynamic of appearing and appearance.

⁴ *LI*, p. 862.

⁵ *BT*, p. 51.

⁶ *Ibidem*.

the outset of an investigation for Plato, but rather it can only be established on the basis of the dialectical interrogation of what appears in the cognitive interrogation of a sought-after unknown.

The Platonic notion of phenomenal likeness, however, is nevertheless implicit in Heidegger's account of the phenomenological concept of phenomenon as self-showing, given the contrast he draws between its mode of showing itself in itself and the semblance's making «a pretention of showing itself»⁷. For Plato, as we've seen, the sought-after unknown appears with its hypothetical positing as something already known. In back of Heidegger's phenomenological distinction between the «positive and primordial signification of *phainomenon*»⁸, which shows itself from itself, and its «privative modification»⁹ in which «it *can* show itself *as* something which it is *not*»¹⁰, therefore, is the cognitive context of the Platonic appearance. But missing from Heidegger's account of this distinction is the cognitive problem of making the unknown appear. One result of the absence of this cognitive problem in Heidegger's account of the phenomenological concept of phenomenon is that it introduces a distinction within the concept of phenomenon, between the showing *itself* that is inseparable from *what* is manifest, and the *in itself* that is verified by the manifest as the showing that is indeed what it purports to show and therefore make manifest¹¹.

Because, as we've seen, the precedent for Husserl's phenomenological concept of appearance is Aristotle's concept of appearance, which rules out semblance without the need for dialectical intervention, Heidegger's concept of phenomenon introduces a distinction not present in Husserl's concept. Appearance for Husserl thus does not entail the "self-showing" of anything "in itself". It is showing, appearance, pure and simple. Or, rather, it is such once the phenomenon has been doubly purified, of 1) transcendent apperception and 2) the psycho-empirical reality of the soul and empirical reality in general. The first purification is fully realized in Husserl's phenomenological reduction, or better, transcendental phenomenological reduction. The second is realized in what is called the ideation of essences in the *LI* and thereafter their eidetic intuition. Once suitably purified, pure phenomenology subjects the phenomenon «to a purely immanent, purely descriptive examination into essence»¹².

5. Reduction and Purification of Phenomenon in Husserl and the Meaning of 'Intentional Object'

The reduction's purification of the phenomenon also clears up an ambiguity in the phenomenological meaning of the intentional object that plagued the *LI* and continues to plague readers of Husserl who cannot catch the nuance that the reduction introduces to the concept of phenomenon. Husserl initially (in the First Edition of *LI*) distinguished what belongs to the intrinsic (*reellen*) content of the lived-experience from the intentional object referred to by that lived-experience, which left ambiguous the following: whether by 'intentional object' phenomenology understood the transcendent object

⁷ *Ibidem.*

⁸ *Ibidem.*

⁹ *Ibidem.*

¹⁰ *Ibidem.*

¹¹ Heidegger radically distinguishes the Kantian notion of "appearance" from the meaning he stipulates for the phenomenological concept of phenomenon, because of the Kantian concept's connection to that which doesn't appear, namely the "thing in-itself". On the basis of this distinction Heidegger rejects any association of "appearance" with phenomenon. However, because neither in Plato nor Aristotle is the phenomenon inseparable from the notion of a non-appearing thing in-itself, "appearance" is a perfectly acceptable translation of phenomenon in the Ancient Greek philosophical context.

¹² *LI*, p. 863.

simpliciter, supposedly both beyond and other than lived-experience, or whether it understood by ‘intentional object’ the object of such lived-experience insofar as it appears to it as an objective content of its conscious moment. The reduction makes it clear (or should make it clear) that by ‘intentional object’ phenomenology means the object as it appears to consciousness, not the putative object that is somehow external to the mind and independent of human experience. Husserl is a total Humean in this regard. Experience is the only possible basis for knowledge of the objectivity of objects supposedly transcendent to the mind. Any knowledge claims about the being of an object that lack an experiential basis therefore likewise lack any possible intelligibility, because the claim that an object is completely transcendent to human experience must deny the only possible *cognitive* basis upon which that claim can be confirmed as true: the experience in which the putative evidence for that claim must necessarily be made manifest. The claim that an object is completely transcendent and therefore other than human experience thus cannot escape the aspect of that experience that provides the motivating evidence for asserting the object’s transcendence. The phenomenological commitment to *evidence* therefore rules out in principle the legitimacy of any cognitive claims about the object and its putative objectivity that bypass the sole basis for making such claims: the lived-experience inseparable from the evidence which presents the grounds for the object’s transcendence.

The exclusive meaning of the intentional object, as that which appears to the conscious moment of lived-experience, is what is codified by the transcendental phenomenological reduction. It stipulates the “bracketing” of the “index” of the transcendent existence that is coincident with the positing of the intentional object as a being beyond and therefore other than lived-experience. With this, the belief that naturally accompanies the positing of a being that is completely independent of lived-experience is “put out of play”, in the sense that the performer of the reduction pulls back from the assumed truth of that belief. As a result, the transcendental phenomenological reduction privileges the intentional object’s meaning in terms of that which appears to lived-experience. The privilege here, it must be emphasized, is methodological. Thus, what the reduction stipulates is decidedly *not* that the *being* of the intentional object is coincident with its appearance to consciousness. The existence of objects transcendent to lived-experience is therefore not rejected by the reduction but rather radically affirmed, precisely insofar as what it brackets and puts out of play is not the legitimacy of the intentional object’s status as a being that is transcendent to consciousness. What is rejected by the reduction, rather, is the acceptance of the truth of that status in the absence of its evidential substantiation. In other words, the reduction functions to neutralize the *belief* native to the intentionality of lived-experience that its intentional object is really transcendent to it, pending an investigation of the evidence that alone is capable of justifying this belief.

This need for evidential substantiation arises from the critical concerns that guide Husserl’s early pre-phenomenological philosophical investigations of mathematics and logic. These critical concerns are *foundational*. On Husserl’s view, the prevailing late 19th century philosophies of the sciences of mathematics and logic were epistemically wanting, in that they were unable to account for the ideal and formalized meanings appealed to by the cognitive claims of these sciences. Specifically, Husserl argued that both empirical and rational epistemologies appealed to ideal and formalized meanings whose givenness in experience they nevertheless either explained away empirically or argued away rationally. Husserl’s phenomenological investigation of the appearance of the intentional object to lived-experience was thus the outgrowth of his critical preoccupation to provide a philosophical account of the ideal and formalized meanings presupposed by late 19th century mathematics and logic. The concept of appearance in Husserl’s phenomenology, in the sense of the pure phenomenon, is thus inseparable from these critical concerns. But it is not reducible to them.

6. *Appearance of the Pure Phenomenon in Ideation and Eidetic Intuition*

A case in point is ideation's development into eidetic intuition. Originally, ideation was formulated by Husserl as the method to bring to evidence, as pure phenomena, the ideal structures presupposed by logic. Its point of departure is the lived-experience of general meaning, which is brought to prominence and then isolated in an intuition. It accomplishes the former by generating a manifold of lived-experiences and the latter by thematizing the logical content of the unity that encompasses the instances of general meaning common to each of the discrete lived-experiences composing the manifold. Crucial to the generation of the manifold in question was that its composition exceed empirically given lived-experiences. The comparison of empirically given general meaning can only make prominent and isolate in intuition empirical generalities, and not the "pure" – because unconditional – universality coincident with logical meaning. Generation of a manifold that is unrestricted by empirical limits requires the imaginative variation of an originally given empirical manifold. Despite Husserl's initial characterization of this variation as "free", from the beginning the crucial methodical protocol for the imaginative extension of the empirically given manifold was that the variation involved be guided; guided initially by 1) the empirical style characteristic of the unity yielded by the comparison of the empirically general meaning common to the members of the empirically given manifold and then by 2) the pure essence eventually yielded by the empirical style's imaginative extension.

Husserl's early critics, alas, either missed or disregarded this protocol with their worry that ideation disregarded or otherwise undervalued the empirical or factual dimension of experience. For Husserl, the empirical is clearly there in the phenomenon from the start; as the undeniable point of departure for the comparison that yields the empirical style that functions as the guiding clue for the ideation proper, the empirical dimension of experience, or better, its intelligible structure, is manifestly not disregarded. Nor does the highlighting of its intelligible structure undervalue, for instance, its ontological status, since that status is the very basis for the appearance of the pure phenomenon in ideation. This same early criticism is equally misguided when directed at the eidetic intuition developed out of ideation. Eidetic intuition follows the same methodological protocols as ideation, save for its extension of the guiding clue to include empirical styles common to all aspects of lived-experience, not just those whose unfolding yields the idealities that comprise the species of pure logic.

One critic, however, who didn't miss the important methodological protocol here was Heidegger. His criticism raised the crucial issue of Husserl's pre-phenomenal starting point, by questioning the ontological originality of Husserl's empirical formulation of perceptual lived-experience. Heidegger's critique thus accepted the phenomenological legitimacy of Husserl's account of the pure phenomena of logic and the eidetic intuition of the *eidē* that structure perceptual lived-experience, save for Husserl's interpretation of the ontologically foundational originality of these structures. I'll return to Heidegger's powerful and in many ways fateful (for the development of *transcendentally* pure phenomenology) critique, but now will address the critical concern in back of Husserl's own critique of ideation and the initial formulation of eidetic intuition. Psychologism.

7. *Husserl's Self-Critique of his Early Platonistic Account of the Phenomenon of the Pure Logical Species*

Husserl's original formulation of ideation explicitly embraced what he himself characterized as Platonism, in an effort to account for the formal universality of the logical species despite its presentation in lived-experience. The problem raised by the presentation of logical objectivity in lived-experience concerned precisely how the formal universality that is inseparable from logical meaning can be maintained in the face of its appearance in a lived-experience that is neither formal nor

universal. Husserl thought he could do this by maintaining that rather than be presented directly in lived-experience as its intentional object, the ideal species instead was instantiated by lived-experience, in its acts of logical cognition. This, of course, raised – and for those who still find Husserl’s account of instantiation compelling, raises – the question of the status of the un-instantiated species. Husserl’s answer, following Bernard Bolzano, was that the status in question was that of an “objectivity in-itself”, the meaning-content of which was intrinsically untouchable by lived-experience. While this notion took care of one crucial concern of psychologism, or better, of logical psychologism, Husserl soon recognized that it left the phenomenological status of the logical species completely unaccounted for, in the sense that it presupposed rather than brought to evidence the species’ rational being. In his view, then, the solution to the problem of psychologism he advanced in the *LI* was not philosophical, as it presupposed uncritically a rational psychology.

Husserl’s philosophical response to the evidential shortcomings of the *LI*’s rational psychology is what is behind his phenomenology’s transcendental turn. Following this turn, the formal universality of logical meaning is, after all, now recognized as something given in the non-formal and non-universal flow of lived-experience, albeit in a lived-experience in which the positing of contingent and causally determined psycho-empirical reality has been neutralized by the transcendental phenomenological reduction. The immanent subjective status of such lived-experience Husserl now understood to include the non-flowing ideality of all objective meaning, and not just the formal universality of logical meaning. Analyzing how, within the Heraclitean flow of transcendently reduced lived-experience, the ideality, or better, *irreality* of objective meaning is given, in the precise sense of its non-flowing and therefore motionless appearance in that flow as an identity inseparable from its unity, became the primary task of Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology. At stake in this task for Husserl, which he referred to as “constitutional analysis”, is nothing less than establishing phenomenology as a bona fide philosophy. The failure to account for the subjective constitution of objective meaning, for Husserl, is tantamount to the failure to overcome psychologism in its most sophisticated guise: transcendental psychologism.

8. *Husserl’s Account of the Distinction between Reell and Irreell Part-Whole Relations and the Constitution of Irreality*

Husserl’s account of *irreality* as something that despite its constitution “in” lived-experience, and thus that despite the flowing, subjective character of the latter in which it makes its necessary and irrevocable appearance, nevertheless exhibits the hallmarks of the objective character of meaning, focuses on the distinction between *reell* and *irreell* part-whole relations. Lived-experience for Husserl is an immanent temporal whole composed of parts that intrinsically belong to that whole, in the precise sense that «they can be found in its immanent temporality»¹³. Husserl characterizes this intrinsic relation of belonging in terms of the parts’ *reell* inclusion in the temporal unity characteristic of the whole of the lived-experience. This means that the manifold of those parts, that is, the manifold of hyletic data (sense impressions), the «intentional characters»¹⁴ of that hyletic data, and the synthesis of those intentional characters into appearances of objective meaning, «have a *reelle* unity of lived-experience and a certain peculiar species (*Art*) of being bound to one another, which is called the synthesis of appearances»¹⁵. The phenomenal relation between these *reell* parts, which are «ever

¹³ *PP*, p. 132.

¹⁴ *Ivi*, p. 133.

¹⁵ *Ivi*, p. 132.

new»¹⁶ and «temporally separated»¹⁷. contrasts with the phenomenal relation between the appearing object that appears in and through them. The latter, despite its appearance in the manifold parts intrinsic to lived-experience, is not manifold but maintained by Husserl to be «one in numerical identity»¹⁸. Thus, while no *reell* part can be identical with another, owing to its temporal discreteness as a phase belonging to the manifold whole of a lived-experience, the appearance of the object manifest in each part, as a phase of that manifold, is *irreell* for Husserl. It is so in the precise sense of its identity being maintained despite the manifold manner of its appearance. Husserl puts it this way:

But if we restrict ourselves to what is exhibited and shown within the streaming perception itself, we see, then: the synthesis of streaming appearances in the same object [*im selben Objekt*] . . . has the marvelous specific property on the one hand of being a *reell* synthesis and on the other hand containing in every phase something *irreell*, namely, of having ‘in’ itself in separated phases evidently the same numerically identical object which is called *irreell* in relation to the immanent synthesis of lived-experience. It could also be called ideal in this relation because it is evidently the same,¹⁹ whereas the separate phases of lived-experience cannot intrinsically (*reellen*) contain anything identical.

That is, objective meaning is constituted as something that is *not reell* in the precise sense that: 1) it does not share the non-identity of the subjective phases of the manifold that composes the temporal unity of lived-experience, and 2), unlike the *reell* inclusion of those phases in that temporal unity, the objective meaning is not an intrinsic part of that unity. The phenomenal result of 1) for Husserl is the invariance inseparable from objective meaning, in the exact sense of the appearance of the object remaining one and the same throughout the variations of the descriptively characterized “flowing” or “streaming” synthesis of the non-identical *reellen* phases of lived-experience that exhibit the appearing of the object’s appearance. And the phenomenal result of 2) is the transcendence inseparable from the objective appearance, in the exact sense of its not being an intrinsic (*reell*) part of the lived-experience in which it nevertheless appears.

9. Husserl’s Account of the Universal Homogeneity of Objectivities as Objectivities

Husserl’s account of the constitution of the *irreality* of objective meaning on the basis of its identity as numerically one beyond the manifold of its appearing thus addresses the status of the evidence in which the logical species is given. This evidence, we’ve seen, Husserl himself admits is not addressed in his Platonist account of objective meaning. Thus, rather than account for the objectivity of formal logical meaning by appealing to an objectivity in-itself that is instantiated by acts of lived-experience but otherwise radically other than the acts that instantiate it, Husserl’s account of the givenness of *irreality* now situates it in terms of its appearance *in*, rather than instantiation by, lived-experience. Husserl is quite clear, however, that this account of *irreality* deals not just with the objectivity of formal logical meaning but with all objectivities, «as objectivities»²⁰. While such objectivities include the formal and universal meaning of the logical species, they also include non-formal and non-universal objectivities, like Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata and the perceptual objects given in external

¹⁶ *Ibidem.*

¹⁷ *Ibidem.*

¹⁸ *Ibidem.*

¹⁹ *Ivi*, p. 134.

²⁰ *FTL*, p. 155.

and internal perception. Thus, Husserl's account of the transcendence and unity characteristic of objectivities as objectivities is focused on «the universal homogeneity of objectivities»²¹.

The homogeneity at issue here is the constitution of the *irreality* of any object whatever in the manifold of lived-experience that yields the object's objectivity in the numerical identity, the being one, of its appearance in contrast to the non-identity of the *reellen* phases of the manifold that comprise the lived-experience in which it appears. Husserl radically distinguishes the universality of this homogeneity from the ideational generalization that yields the universal meanings of logical objectivity. The latter are given in evidence that is initially generated by the *comparison* of the lived-experience of particular objects, which yields the general meaning in question as an overlapping coincidence of the particulars under it. Thus, Husserl writes:

*The manifold of objectivities of the understanding, which in the latter case constitute the extension of the universal, must, as belonging to its objective content, be rigorously distinguished from the multiplicity of meaning (Sinn) in which this generality is intended at any given time, in which, therefore, it is posited, whether in an empty intention or intuitively.*²²

What must be distinguished, then, is the manifold of lived-experiences whose phases, composed of *reellen* intentional parts, manifest a manifold of meaning that intends the numerical unity constitutive of the *irreality* that in turn manifests the transcendence characteristic of all objectivity, from the manifold of objectivities that compose the extension of a given generic universality. (The manifold of these objectivities, it is important to note, for Husserl «can be individual particulars but also, in the case of higher generalities, can themselves again be objectivities of the understanding»)²³. The manifold constitutive of the *irreality* of objectivity posits that objectivity as something that is homogeneous, in the precise sense that the unity of the intentional meaning posited by the lived-experiences belonging to this manifold is, as Husserl puts it in *FTL*, «the Same»²⁴. The manifold of objectivities of the understanding, in contrast, are composed of both different universalities (e.g., 'nature', 'spirit') and different levels of universality ('material ontology', 'formal ontology'). Thus, in contrast to the homogeneity posited by the manifold of lived-experiences constitutive of the *irreality* of objectivity per se, the understanding posits objectivities that are heterogeneous.

10. Husserl's Account of the Distinction between the Manifold of Lived-Experiences in which the Irreality of the Object Appears from the Manifold of Individual Objects Embraced by the Extension of the Universal

Despite the radical difference between the manifolds constitutive of the homogeneity of all objectivities as objectivities and the heterogeneity of the content of those objectivities, that is, the heterogeneity of the generic universals proper to the regions of being (including phenomenological "being") and the manifold objects that comprise their extension, Husserl maintains that, «like every objectivity of the understanding, a general objectivity is *irreell*»²⁵. However, he sharply distinguishes

²¹ *Ibidem*.

²² *EJ*, p. 317/264 (original German, then English translation, page numbers).

²³ *Ibidem*.

²⁴ *FTL*, p. 145.

²⁵ *EJ*, p. 316/263.

the «*manifold of constitutive lived-experiences* in which it [the *irreality* of the object] appears» from «*the extension of the objects which . . . [the general objectivity] embraces in the manner of generality*».²⁶ Thus, Husserl holds that «[e]ven if it is given intuitively, so that we intuit the universal from a cogiven object pertaining to this generality as a particularity, it is certainly exemplified *in this object*, but not in the constitutive lived-experience in which it is intuitively given»²⁷. Husserl's stress of the fact that the lived-experience does *not* exemplify the *irreality* of the object, of course, marks the significant reversal of his earlier position, which, we saw, maintained precisely the opposite: that the objectivity of the species was indeed exemplified by the lived-experience.

Husserl's mature view of the constitution of objectivity also refines his earlier position regarding its temporality. His earlier account of the ideal status of objectivity invited the interpretation of its temporal status as extra-temporal, in the sense of being beyond and therefore outside the subjective flow of lived-experience and with that other than the immanent streaming of the temporality of that flow. His mature view, however, as we've seen, locates the constitution of objectivity's *irreality* in precisely that streaming, albeit not its perceptual givenness, with its temporal modality of the present. Thus, Husserl writes, «[p]erception is never a full objectivating performance, if we understand such performance to be indeed the seizing upon an object itself»²⁸. Husserl's reason for this is that we accept perception (internal and external) «as a seizing upon an object itself, only because we are tacitly taking into account possible recollection, repeatable at will»²⁹. Husserl elaborates that «[w]hen actualized, recollection gives for the first-time original certainty of the being»³⁰ of the subjective or objective «*object* in the full sense . . . as something acquired originaliter and identifiable at will, something to which we can 'always go back again' and which one can recognize in a reactivation as the selfsame»³¹. Husserl notes he himself was «misled»³² in the *Logical Investigations* regarding the «very different roles»³³ that the “self-giving” [*Selbstgebung*] of objectivities plays, accordingly as they are given in perception as real [*reale*] or in recollection as ideal [*irreell*]. Because *irreell* objectivities «*have no temporal loci to bind them individuatingly*»³⁴. Husserl now maintains that «such an *irreality* has the temporal being of supertemporality, of *omnitemporality*, which, *nevertheless, is a mode of temporality*»³⁵. From this it follows according to Husserl that «[m]erely because of an essentially possible alteration of attitude or focus [*Einstellungsänderung*], any clear explicit recollection of an ideal species changes into a perception of it – something naturally excluded in the case of temporally individuated objects»³⁶.

²⁶ *Ibidem.*

²⁷ *Ibidem.*

²⁸ *FTL*, p. 157.

²⁹ *Ibidem.*

³⁰ *Ibidem.*

³¹ *Ibidem.*

³² *Ivi*, p. 158 n. 1.

³³ *Ivi*, p. 158.

³⁴ *Ibidem.*

³⁵ *EJ*, p. 313/261.

³⁶ *FTL*, p. 158.

11. *Husserl's Incomplete Account of the Essential Relation between the Manifolds Constitutive of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Unities*

Husserl's account of the status of the appearance of the objectivity of the intentional object presented here, which reflects how we find it in his mature works on logical and mathematical objectivity (*FTL* and *EJ*), represents a radical departure from his *Logical Investigations*. On my view, the radicality of that departure has not been sufficiently appreciated, let alone registered³⁷. To wit, whereas in the *LI* the unity of the objectivity of the appearance appeared in the perceptual manifold of a lived-experience that exemplified the logical species, in Husserl's self-critique of this account, we've seen that the manifold constitutive of the *irreality* is not the manifold intrinsic to individual perceptual lived-experiences. Rather, *irreality* is constituted in the manifold of individual lived-experiences themselves that compose the recollective modification of self-givenness, such that the Same, in the sense of the numerical identity of the unity of objective meaning, appears in the recollective manifold. As we have seen, Husserl himself thematizes the difference between the manifold and unity at issue here. He does so in the distinction he makes between the constitution of the omnitemporality of the irreality characteristic of all objects as objectivities and the manifold and unity at issue in the constitution of the general universality of objects of the understanding. In the latter, the unity of the general object in question is indeed exemplified by the manifold of individual objects that comprise its extension. However, nowhere to my knowledge does Husserl ever address how these two manifolds and their unities are related phenomenologically. That is, Husserl nowhere addresses the issue of *how* the manifold of lived-experiences constitutive of the homogeneous unity of the *irreality* of objectivity is related to the manifold of individual objects constitutive of the heterogeneous unities of the generic universalities that comprise the objects of the understanding. And related to this lacuna, indeed, essentially related to it, Husserl likewise does not address the issue of the relation between the two – by his own admission – radically distinct unities constituted by the different manifolds in question. That is, the relationship between the constitution of the homogeneous unity of the object's *irreell* transcendence and heterogeneous unity of that same object's content marked by Husserl's analyses is not further explored by him.

12. *Neither Heidegger nor Derrida's Critiques of Husserl take into Account his Mature, Albeit Incomplete, Account of the Constitution of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Unity*

Before turning to the question of whether Husserl's phenomenological method possesses the resources to explore these issues, I want to situate them within the context of the foci of the critiques of Husserl's transcendental phenomenology advanced by his two most trenchant and influential critics, Heidegger and Derrida. Heidegger's critique of the perceptual point of departure of Husserl's phenomenology, to which we've already had occasion to allude, does not take into account Husserl's fully developed self-criticism of his Platonistic account of the logical species and ideality generally. As we've seen, that criticism explicitly shifts the locus of the constitution of the *irreality* proper to objective meaning from the manifold constitutive of an individual perceptual lived-experience to the manifold of the individual lived-experiences that comprise recollection. Derrida, in contrast, does take Husserl's self-critique into account, and thus focuses on what he characterizes as the "repetition" that Husserl's recollective account of the omnitemporal constitution of *irreality* introduces. However, Derrida's claim that

³⁷ For instance, Held's otherwise excellent account of the constitution of objective identity in Husserl's mature account of time (1981), focuses exclusively on the manifolds constitutive of the homogeneous irreality of objectivity, and thus does not mention the manifolds constitutive of heterogeneous objectivity, let alone the problem of their phenomenological relation in the constitution of objective identity.

Husserl's account falls short of its goal because of repetition's intrinsic incapacity to transcend the alterity and difference inseparable from the presentational origin of *irreality*, elides completely Husserl's acknowledgment that there is an essential relation between the homogeneous and heterogeneous constitution of unity.

Heidegger's and Derrida's critiques' limitations on these points provide the occasion to consider whether Husserl's last work, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, might address or otherwise provide resources for exploring the nature of the essential relation between the two different manifolds identified by his mature account as constitutive of the appearance of the intentional object. On the surface, it would appear that Husserl's main concern in that work is far from the problem of the constitutive relation between the homogeneous appearance of *irreality* in the manifolds of recollective lived-experiences and the heterogeneous appearance of its universal content. That is, that work's historical reflection, with its task of reactivating the sedimented accomplishments of meaning whose forgotten constitution is behind the crisis of European sciences, seems remote from the ahistorical epistemological concerns that guide his mature account of the appearance of the objectivity of the intentional object.

13. *The Historical Reflection and Reactivation of the Constitution of the Sedimented Meaning behind the Husserl's Account of the Crisis of European Sciences Adumbrates the Essential Relation Between Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Unity*

However, a closer look reveals that the very relationship left unexplored in Husserl's mature epistemological account of the constitution of the *irreality* of the object's appearance is adumbrated by his account of the backward historical reflection that reactivates the sedimented constitution of meaning in the *Crisis*. This account is directed toward the end of clarifying the foundation of the meaning of the generic universalities that constitute the formal and natural sciences that are in crisis over precisely that meaning. On the one hand, there is the recollective character of this historical reflection. Granted, what is reactivated in the recollection at issue is not the past-present of a lived-experience that originated in the individual phenomenologist initiating the reflection, but rather the conditions of possibility of a past-present whose origination belongs to the historical horizon of the individual phenomenologist. But that said, the structure of the historical recollection remains the same as that of the individual recollection: the meaning intended by the historical recollection, like that of the individual recollection, appears as numerically identical, despite the manifold character of its appearing. On the other hand, there is the specific generic content of the universality whose meaning constitution is being reactivated by the historical reflection. As we've seen, the ahistorical constitution of the appearance of objects of the understanding in ideation and eidetic variation is initially guided by the empirical style that emerges in the comparison of individual objects. So, too, is the historical reflection intent on reactivating the constitution of the sedimented meaning connected with the foundational crisis of European sciences a guided reflection, or, better, so too is the reactivation it initiates guided. Granted, this guiding style and, indeed, the origin of its very intelligibility, unlike the guiding style in the eidetic variation constitutive of generic universality, is something that is radically and therefore historically in question. It is in question because of Husserl's discovery that the empirical style of modern natural science is characterized by an historically dated mathematization of the perceptual life-world that alienates that science from its true source in that life-world. So much so, in fact, that Husserl maintains in the *Crisis* that rather than exclude historical investigation, the truly radical epistemological grounding of the meaning that determines European sciences demands it. That is, the radical phenomenological investigation into the historical origin of the meaning (*Sinn*) that guides empirical science is demanded because of the principled failure of ahistorical epistemological

investigations, including Husserl's own investigations, to render intelligible the meaning in question's foundation.

This last demand, and the recognition of the radical historicity of the meaning constitutive of both the exact and empirical European sciences, is, I submit, what provides the connection between the manifold of recollection constitutive of the homogeneous unity of the *irreality* of objectivity with the manifold of objects that constitutes the extension of the heterogeneous unity that composes the content of that objectivity. This is to say, the extension of the recollection constitutive of the *irreality* of the appearance of objectivity beyond the historical present is motivated by the following: the recognition that the meaning of the guiding empirical style inseparable from the appearance of the generic universality appealed to by the epistemological attempt to provide the foundations of the various European sciences is in crisis. It is in crisis in the precise sense that the evidence appealed to in turn by these epistemologies to ground the concepts constitutive of these sciences, is incapable of rendering them fully or even minimally intelligible.

14. The Limits of Heidegger's Critique of Husserl's Account of the Appearance of the Phenomenon and the Superiority of Husserl's Account

Returning now to Heidegger's fateful critique of Husserl's transcendental phenomenology, on the grounds of the supposed lack of ontological originality of the perceptual point of departure of its methodical reflections, we can see the following: that Husserl's mature thought not only is not limited by a point of departure in perception, but also that the historicity of the meaning that provides guiding clues for the appearance of the objectivity of the object in its historical reflection is not limited, as is Heidegger's phenomenology, by an ontological narrative rooted in profundity. We've seen that despite rejecting the Kantian notion of appearance because of its connection with the notion of an unapparent thing in-itself, Heidegger nevertheless introduces the distinction between 1) what shows itself in the manifest and 2) the phenomenon itself. This distinction is behind his claim in *BT* that the phenomenon of phenomenology is precisely «something that proximally and for the most part does *not* show itself at all»³⁸. This claim, in turn, is in back of Heidegger's related claim, contra Husserl, that the true meaning of phenomenological description is interpretation (*Auslegung*), a claim that itself Heidegger thinks legitimizes the hermeneutical recasting of the phenomenological method. With this recasting, however, the phenomenological commitment to evidence, formulated precisely in terms of what is manifest in the appearance, is jettisoned, and replaced with "profound" meta-phenomenological speculations about why the phenomenon itself is not showing itself in itself. The profundity in question being rooted in historical narratives about the ontologies responsible for the concealment and withdrawal of the non-self-showing phenomenon of Being.

The phenomenological superiority of Husserl's notion of appearance, I submit, is that it remains tied to evidence. Granted, the evidence for the essential relation between the unities apparent in homogeneous and heterogeneous manifolds is complex, but even when extended, as I have suggested, to the historical recollection tasked with the reactivation of sedimented meaning (*Sinn*), it is never profound. This is because for Husserl and thus Husserlian phenomenology, the interrogative move beyond the limits of the content of what appears in the appearance is always motivated by references or indications that are manifest in the evident appearance itself. Indeed, the cognitive interest of the methodical reflection that, as we have seen, is the *sine qua non* for the appearance in Husserl's phenomenology, is what recognizes the methodological need to extend its reach beyond what is

³⁸ *BT*, p. 59.

evident in any available appearance. Because, however, of the methodical protocol of Husserlian phenomenology to advance its cognitive claims solely on the basis of what is given in the appearance, the extension of any given phenomenological reflection is necessarily guided by what appears to its regard. Thus, the inadequacy of what appears is nothing profound. For example, the incomplete appearance of the whole of the perceptual object in external perception, or the likewise incomplete appearance of the whole of the streaming of time in immanent consciousness, both of which motivate reflection to extend its regard beyond what appears in any phase of its awareness of the phenomenon, in order to realize the cognition of the essence of the lived-experience in question, does not involve anything that is non-evident. In the perspectival appearance of the external object, or the incomplete appearance of time, there is therefore no evidence of the withdrawal or concealment of the being of the object of perception or of time.

It is likewise the case with the evidence in which the mathematization of nature appears. For example, inseparable from the evidence in which the arithmetization of geometry appears is the absence of any reference to intuitable lines and shapes. Inseparable from the meaning (*Sinn*) of this arithmetization is its lack of reference to the shapes of the perceptual life-world and their idealization in Euclidean geometry. This meaning, then, is capable of functioning as the guiding clue for historical reflections bent on recollectively reactivating the conditions of possibility of the lived-experiences that belong to the historical horizon of the reflecting phenomenologist, which are presupposed by the arithmetization of intuitive geometry. Of course, not just any phenomenologist is capable of extending the scope of phenomenological reflection beyond the recollective horizon of the past-presents constitutive of their own lived-experience to uncover the primal evidences for the sciences at issue here. As Husserl puts it, «what counts as primal evidence for the sciences is determined by an educated person or a sphere of such persons who pose new questions, new historical questions, questions concerning the inner depth-dimension as well as those concerning an external historicity in the social-historical world»³⁹.

15. *Appearance and Truth in Plato, Aristotle, and Husserl*

I want to conclude by returning to the relation of appearance in Husserl to its two Greek precedents in Plato and Aristotle. Recall that in Plato there can be no demonstrative science of the appearance, because what appears is necessarily related to the unknown that has been hypothetically made to appear, toward the end of the dialectical interrogation of the truth of its appearance in relation to that unknown. Recall, also, that in Aristotle a demonstrative science of the appearance is possible, because of its incorrigibility vis-à-vis its eidetic source. While truth and falsity have their provenance in the synthesis of appearances, it is the incorrigible elemental manifestation of those appearances that nevertheless make it possible to establish demonstratively the truth or falsity of a given demonstration. For Husserl, likewise, the elemental appearances are incorrigible. However, because their very appearance is the product of twin methodological interventions, the transcendental reduction and eidetic variation, the question of their truth is not straightforward. Whereas for both Plato and Aristotle, the answer to the question of truth is inseparable from the cognition of beings other than the being of the soul of the knower, the object of cognition in Husserl's phenomenology is first and foremost that of the soul of the knower. This is because, as we've seen, the appearance in Husserl's phenomenology irrevocably and necessarily makes its appearance in the methodological reflection of consciousness' (or, if you will, the soul's) self-perception. Hence, the question that dogged Husserl's

³⁹ *Crisis*, p. 382/373 (German and English pages, respectively).

thought and tortured the thinker of that thought from his earliest to his final phenomenological works: how to slay the spectre of psychologism that is inseparable from his phenomenology's reflective mode of access to the appearance? While his mature account of the appearance of objectivity establishes its non-identity and therefore transcendence from the intrinsic (*reellen*) parts of the lived-experience in which the evidence for its appearance necessarily appears, the question remains whether this account of the transcendence in immanence of the appearance is sufficient to overcome what Husserl himself identified in his mature work as the problem of "transcendental psychologism". Taking up that question, let alone endeavoring to answer it, however, is the task for another occasion.

Bibliography

- Heidegger, M. (1962), (*BT*) *Being and Time*, trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson, Harper and Row, New York 1962.
- Husserl, E. (1970), (*Crisis*) *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, trans. D. Carr, Northwestern University Press, Evanston (Ill.).
- Husserl, E. (1973), (*EJ*) *Experience and Judgment*, trans. J. S. Churchill and K. Ameriks, Northwestern University Press, Evanston.
- Husserl, E. (1969), (*FTL*) *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, trans. D. Cairns, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague.
- Husserl, E. (2001), (*LI*) *Logical Investigations*, 2 vols, trans. J. N. Findlay, Routledge, London and New York.
- Husserl, E. (1977), (*PP*) *Phenomenological Psychology*, trans. J. Scanlon, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague.
- Held, K. (1981), "Phänomenologie der Zeit nach Husserl", in *Perspektiven der Philosophie. Neues Jahrbuch*, vol. 7, pp. 185-221.
- Patočka, J. (2015), *Husserl's Subjectivism and the Call for an Asubjective Phenomenology*, in Chvatík, I., Učník, L., Williams, A. (eds.), *Asubjective Phenomenology. Jan Patočka's Project in the Broader Context of his Work*, Traugott Verlag, Nordhausen, pp. 17-40.

Abstract

A strand in the contemporary engagement with Husserl's phenomenology is united by the critical judgment that the appearing of the appearance paradoxically does not appear in that phenomenology. I argue that it does. My argument has three parts. The first argues that, contra Heidegger, the appearance in Husserl doesn't involve the "self-showing" of anything. The second argues that the appearance in Husserl is a phenomenon doubly purified, from 1) its index of existence and 2) its empirical facticity. The third argues that the appearing of the appearance appears in manifolds of lived-experiences that in turn appear in the only foundation that – from beginning to end – Husserl sought to establish for a philosophical science: the reflectively accessed unities of sense (*Sinn*) given in these manifolds that alone are capable of manifesting phenomenological evidence.

Keywords: Appearance, Phenomenological Reflection, Phenomenological Manifold, Husserl, Phenomenological Evidence